JPRS-TAC-86-013

1 February 1986

Worldwide Report

ARMS CONTROL

FBIS FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service, Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semi-monthly by the National Technical Information Service, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

JPRS-TAC-86-013

1 February 1986

WORLDWIDE REPORT

ARMS CONTROL

CONTENTS

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

LE SOIR on Possible European Space Defense
(Pierre Lefevre; Brussels LE SOIR, 12 Dec 85) 1

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR Hits U.S. Accusations of Treaty Violations
(Various sources, various dates) 7

Secret Report Undermines Agreement 7
U.S. Officials Cited 7
U.S. Violating 'Commitments' 8
Weinberger Undermining Treaty 9
USSR Complying Treaties 9
Weinberger's Remarks Hit 10
Charges Termed 'Fabrications' 10

Briefs
USSR: U.S. Tests Midgetman 12
TASS on Pentagon's D-5 Plans 12
TASS Cites Senator Kennedy 12

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

Moscow Claims U.S. Cheating on Number of Euromissiles
(Aleksandr Druzhinin; Moscow World Service, 9 Jan 86) ... 13

Moscow Contrasts Soviet, NATO Disarmament Initiatives
(Konstantin Sorokin; Moscow in English to Great Britain,
17 Dec 85) 14

IZVESTIYA Views Dialogue on Netherlands Missiles
(Stanislav Kondrashov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 10 Jan 86) 16

Netherlands Stance on Nuclear Issues Examined by PRAVDA
(V. Drobkov; Moscow PRAVDA, 8 Jan 86) 19

TASS: FRG Public Protests Pershing-2 Deployment
(Moscow TASS, 10 Jan 86) 21

Soviet Commentators View FRG Stance on Missile Stationing
(Various sources, various dates) 22

Grigoryev in PRAVDA, by Yevgeniy Grigoryev 22
Aksyonov Comments 23
Levin on Missiles 24
More by Aksyonov 25

Briefs
TASS on UK First Phase 26
Moscow Cites Daily Express 26
Soviet-Danish Talks Held 26
TASS on FRG Letter to U.S. 27
TASS Notes German Statement 27

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: Chemical Weapons Disarmament Committee Resumes Work
(Moscow TASS, 13 Jan 86) 28

Session Opens 28
Delays Without 'Justification' 28

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA: Decisions Required for Progress at CDE Session
(M. Kostikov; Moscow PRAVDA, 11 Jan 86) 30

Briefs
Soviet-French CDE Consultations 33

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

Gorbachev Replies To Address by London Council Head
(Moscow TASS International Service, 2 Jan 86) 34

PRAVDA Asks U.S. Not To 'Miss Chance' of Test Ban
(N. Prozhogin; Moscow PRAVDA, 24 Dec 85) 36

IZVESTIYA Decries U.S. Stand on Test Ban Treaty
(Valentin Falin; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 21 Dec 85) 40

IZVESTIYA Cites U.S. Opinion on Nuclear Test Ban
(V. Soldatov; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 25 Dec 85) 44

USSR Awaits U.S. Response in Joining Moratorium
(Various sources, various dates) 47

'No Right to Ignore It', by Kim Gerasimov 47
Moratorium Keeps With Geneva Spirit, by
Vladislav Kozyakov 48

Verification, Control 'No Obstacle' 49
U.S. Has 'Unique Opportunity', by Aleksandr Druzhinin 50
Need for Reciprocity, by Viktor Vasilyev 51
Lack of Response Lamented, by Viktor Yenikeyev 52
Soviet Scientists Appeal 54
Joint Step Urged 55
'Positive Answer' Urged 56
Loud Public Demand, by Vitaliy Sobolev 57
'Road to Happy Future', by Velikhov 58
Moratorium 'Canceled' If U.S. Fails to Join 60
'Perverted Logic' Questioned 60

USSR Attacks Washington's Rejection of Moratorium
(Various sources, various dates) 62

U.S. Disregards Public Opinion 62
U.S. Claims Verification Problems 63
'Still Time' to Review Position, by A. Mozgovoy 64
U.S. To Continue Testing 65
TASS Notes Rejection 66
U.S. Rejection Due to SDI 67
U.S. Reaction 'Regrettable' 68
U.S. Failing to Display 'Goodwill' 69
U.S., Soviet Attitudes Contrasted, by Vladimir Tsvetov 70
U.S. Responses 'Mere Excuses', by M. Ponomarev 71
U.S. Arguments Viewed 73
U.S. Logic Criticized 74

USSR on Reasons Behind U.S. Moratorium Stance
(Vladimir Posner, et al.; Moscow World Service, 13 Jan 86) 76

Soviet Groups Urge U.S. To Subscribe to Moratorium
(Various sources, various dates) 81

Moscow TV Interviews Public 81
USSR Committee for European Security 82
Friendship Group Cables Reagan 83
Academician on Environmental Consequences 83
AUCCTU Statement 84
Leningrad Citizens Interviewed, by A. Morgunov,
R. Zhamgaryan 85

USSR's Arbatov Examines U.S. Attitude to Moratorium
(Georgiy Arbatov Interview; Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO,
30 Dec 85) 86

Moscow Cites International Calls to U.S. To Agree To Test Ban
(Various sources, various dates) 89

'Still Enough Time', by Boris Kalyagin 89
UN Delegates Cited 90

U.S. Groups Cited 91
U.S. Officials Cited 92
SED's Jarowinskiy Lauds USSR 93
GDR Dismisses Monitoring Objections 93
FRG SDP Disarmament Expert 94
PRAVDA Cites Hungarian Support 94
SRV Ministers View U.S. Rejection 95
Latin American Human Rights Group 95
Indonesian Foreign Minister Cited 96

Moscow: UK Paper Attempts To Justify U.S. Rejection of Moratorium
(Viktor Levin; Moscow Domestic Service, 24 Dec 85) 97

TASS: 'Hostile Reception' Given to Congress SDI Test Ban
(Moscow TASS, 30 Dec 85) 99

U.S. Magazine Cited by Moscow on Moratorium Issue
(Moscow IZVESTIYA, 24 Dec 85) 100

TASS Observer on Peace Year, Moratorium
(Moscow TASS International Service, 31 Dec 85) 101

USSR's Kuznetsov Calls for Ending Nuclear Tests
(Vladlen Kuznetsov; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 1, Jan 86) 103

USSR: Nuclear Tests Show Hardening U.S. View
(Editorial; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 51, 13 Dec 85) 109

USSR Decries 'Goldstone' Nuclear Blast
(Various sources, various dates) 111

Disproves White House Assurances 111
Disproves Non-Nuclear Claims 111
'Reckless Practical Deeds' 112
U.S. Intentions Questioned, by Vitaliy Korionov 113
Opposition Grows, by Aleksandr Zholkver 114
Time for 'Correct Decision' 115
Blast Exposes U.S. 116
TASS Statement 117
Perle Justification Decried, by A. Tolkunov 118

TASS: Pentagon To Continue Antisatellite Weapon Tests
(Moscow TASS, 25 Dec 85) 120

TASS: Nevada Tests Connected With X-Ray Laser Development
(Moscow TASS, 22 Dec 85) 121

AFP: U.S. Offer to Witness Nevada Tests Denounced
(AFP, 26 Dec 85) 122

IZVESTIYA: Wolfowitz Warns New Zealand on Port Calls
(I. Kovalev; Moscow IZVESTIYA, 16 Dec 85) 123

Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone Idea Detailed by Soviet Paper
(Ye. Sankov; Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, 26 Dec 85) 124

Moscow: Greece Favors Nuclear-Free Zone in Balkans
(Moscow in Greek to Greece, 25 Dec 85) 125

USSR Examines Support in UK for Nuclear-Free Zones
(Boris Belitskiy; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 6 Jan 86) 127

USSR's Lomeyko Announces Exchange of Soviet, U.S. Addresses
(Moscow TASS, 27 Dec 85) 129

Publicist Says USSR To Adhere to Moratorium
(Prague Domestic Service, 9 Jan 86) 130

XINHUA Reports 'Harsh' U.S. Attitude Toward South Pacific
(Sun Tingzheng; Beijing XINHUA, 16 Jan 86) 131

Briefs
TASS on U.S. Interceptor Test 133
TASS: U.S. 'Secret' Underground Tests 133
Underground Nuclear Tests 133

RELATED ISSUES

Corbachev Issues Statement on Eliminating All Nuclear Weapons
(Moscow PRAVDA, 16 Jan 86; Moscow Television Service, 15 Jan 86) 134

Gorbachev Issues Statement, by M. S. Gorbachev 134
West Must Respond to Statement, by Igor Fesunenko 143

Gorbachev Greets Scientific Congress on Peaceful Future
(Moscow TASS, 16 Jan 86) 144

USSR 12 January Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'
(Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, et al.; Moscow Domestic Service, 12 Jan 86) 146

USSR's Zagladin Views Prospects for Peace, Prosperity
(Vadim Zagladin; Moscow NEW TIMES, No 1, Jan 86) 148

New Book by Bovin Reviewed in PRAVDA
(A. Ivkin; Moscow PRAVDA, 10 Jan 86) 153

Moscow Advocates Resumption of Nuclear Talks With UK
(Valentin Vasilyets; Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland, 8 Jan 86) 154

TASS: Kohl Discusses FRG Policy on Security Issues
(Moscow TASS, 9 Jan 86) 156

PRAVDA: Bulgarian Minister on Arms Race, East-West Relations
(P. Mladenov; Moscow PRAVDA, 9 Jan 86) 157

USSR: Romania, Bulgaria Support Soviet Stand at Geneva
(Moscow TASS, 23 Dec 85) 160

USSR: Peace Year Heralds Opportunity for Change
(Various sources, various dates) 161

'Positive Developments' Possible, Editorial 161
Action Needed for Reality, Editorial 163
Soviet Proposals Strengthen Hope, by Georgiy Zubkov 164
Signs of Change Apparent, by Anatoliy Krasikov 165
'Dangerous Policy' Denounced, by Nikolay Pastukhov 166
'Real Consolidation of Peace', by Viktor Levin 167

Soviet Commentator Views Nordic Affairs in Swedish Paper
(Yuriy Denisov; Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER, 7 Jan 86) 169

Briefs
USSR's Kuznetsov Meets Danish Parliamentarians 170
IZVESTIYA Cites Pope 170

SDI AND SPACE ARMS

LE SOIR ON POSSIBLE EUROPEAN SPACE DEFENSE

Brussels LE SOIR in French 12 Dec 85 p 8

[Article by Pierre Lefevre: "The 'Euro-Star Wars,' or: 'Should Europe Be Provided With a Shield Against the Soviet Missiles?'"]

[Text] Will Europe some day have its own defense shield against the missiles that the USSR is aiming at it--one similar to the system of defense in space (the Strategic Defense Initiative) with which President Reagan wants to equip the United States toward the end of the century? A kind of "Euro-Star Wars," perhaps, or a European pillar of the SDI?

There are those who think so, in any case, particularly in military circles and the major industries that are interested in defense programs. Spurred on by the American proposals for collaboration with the SDI, the countries of the Old World have moreover speeded up their deliberations. And even as they continue their efforts to find the right formula for their cooperation with the American version of Star Wars, one can see the concept of a "little sister" of the SDI developing in people's minds--a version that we already realize could well be called "IDEA," for "Initiative for the Defense of European Aerospace"; or perhaps "EDI," for "European Defense Initiative"; or even "EADI," for "European Aerospace Defense Initiative." [all three acronyms and their expansions published in English]. Technically, it would be a "theater antimissile defense," which--as we shall see--would be much more in the nature of a land and air system than a space system.

These deliberations seem to be most advanced in Federal Germany, the country most directly exposed to the Soviet missiles. The German minister of defense reportedly planned to use the occasion of a NATO meeting last week to bring the matter up with his British colleague. But the question is also receiving close attention in the Netherlands, Italy, France, and--of course--Great Britain. London--which is eagerly negotiating its participation in SDI and especially the scientific and technological spin-offs that it could derive therefrom--could well view any such European extension of the SDI as the best way of ensuring to its industry and its laboratories a substantial share of the contracts that are linked to these new strategic developments. Various industrial groups not only in Great Britain but elsewhere (AEROSPATIALE [National Industrial Aerospace Company] in France and Messerschmitt-Boelkow-Blohm in the FRG, for example)--fearing that they will receive only the

crumbs from the American program--have taken an intense interest in the idea and are already, in some instances, supporters of a European antimissile defense system.

It is of course still no more than an idea. Certain government officials, however, are already planning to use it as a means of exerting pressure to obtain concessions from the Soviets in the Geneva negotiations on medium-range nuclear weapons--something that could itself suffice to accredit the idea. The basic concept of SDI was launched in March 1983 in a speech by President Reagan. We are able today to measure the progress it has already made. We shall examine here the principal political, strategic, and technical facets that "little sister" Euro-Star Wars would present.

A Real Political Minefield

It is easy to foresee the advantages that a European SDI would offer, at least in theory: a diminution of the threat posed by the SS 20's and the multiple Soviet tactical missiles; the possibility of reducing in number--and even of eliminating from European soil--the nuclear missiles that are ranged against those weapons; the assurance of a better distribution of the technological and economic developments linked to the SDI; and a means for exercising considerable pressure at the negotiating table. At first glance the pacifists themselves should be pleased with the idea; from the political standpoint such an initiative would be nothing less than a veritable minefield, more explosive perhaps than the question of the Euromissiles.

First of all, it is difficult to foresee what attitude will be adopted toward this proposal not only by the pacifist movements but also by the currents of moderate opinion in general. Despite its defensive rather than offensive character, a European SDI could be regarded as a form of escalation or new arms race that would involve the most sophisticated weapons and would generate new tensions between East and West, not to mention the fact that it could give rise to nuclear hardware of its own.

And What About Detente?

In the eyes of many, the proposal would appear to run counter to the spirit of detente that appears to prevail today, characterized notably by Mr Gorbachev's offer to negotiate with Europeans for a reduction in the respective arsenals on the European continent. The impression that the Soviets would be prepared to seek an agreement on medium-range missiles in the absence of a compromise on strategic or space weapons--an impression confirmed by the Reagan-Gorbachev meeting in Geneva--has rekindled hopes in our countries, and a European SDI would quickly extinguish these hopes. For this reason the politicians are not speaking--and will undoubtedly not speak for a long time yet--of such a program except as a bargaining chip to expedite the negotiations on intermediate weapons: in other words, as a concept rather than a reality.

To convince European public opinion--which is perhaps less ready than its American counterpart to entrust its fate to high technology--a Euro-Star Wars should also evince a high degree of credibility. Any failure of an antimissile shield would be dramatic, in a Europe with a high population density.

Very Expensive

The cost of the project--experts estimate it rather arbitrarily at between 500 billion and 1.3 trillion Belgian francs--presents another sizable difficulty. It is hard to see the countries of Europe mobilizing such sums in the current budgetary circumstances and at a moment when--in response to the American pressures--they are already having to support increased expenses in the area of conventional armament. Choosing the option of an antimissile defense would inevitably entail a reduction of the conventional effort--something that could not fail to trouble most strategists. Europe would also have to learn to cooperate much more fully in the areas of research and defense than it does at present. Unless, of course, it relies on the United States and leaves it up to that country to develop the European shield as an extension of its own. That would undoubtedly translate into less expense and fewer responsibilities, but also fewer spin-off benefits and less independence.

Severing the Ties

A European SDI reopens another politically sensitive debate: the debate concerning severance of the ties with NATO. On the one hand, a European initiative based on the American model would give the impression of a united front, of Atlantic cohesion. In the United States it is already being argued that a defense of the nuclear sites in the Old World would furnish the latter with proof that Washington wants to protect its Euromissiles--that privileged link between its forces in Europe and its central strategic system--and therefore with proof that abandoning Europe in the event of aggression is out of the question.

There is a vague suspicion, however, that a European antimissile shield would on the other hand constitute a supplementary level--another "layer"--in the gradation of the means of defense against a possible Soviet attack in Europe. In other words, Europe's principal umbrella and the major component of deterrence--the ultimate American nuclear response against the USSR--would become a little more remote; the assurance of a major U.S. commitment to stand at our side would decrease in proportion as the possibility of containing the conflict on this side of the Atlantic increases. It is a prospect that would also undermine in the same proportion the confidence of Europeans that they have the unconditional support of their ally--a confidence that is one of the most reliable motivating factors in the Atlantic Alliance.

The ABM Treaty

We shall not restate the arguments used in the debate over the strategic defense initiative in general, and especially the fear that the SDI would create a serious strategic instability--or the possibility that the USSR would respond by increasing the number and sophistication of its missiles to the point that they could saturate or penetrate the Western defense system.

One point remains to be mentioned: the question of respect for agreements. The ABM (Anti-Ballistic Missiles) Treaty, concluded by Washington and Moscow in 1972 and revised in 1974--a treaty that strictly limits the deployment of antimissile missiles--explicitly pertains only to the American and Soviet territories: Europe is not mentioned. It likewise applies only to ballistic

missiles and not to the new generations of intermediate and tactical missiles--the ones that relate to a European defense.

This treaty, however, prohibits the transfer of antimissile systems to other countries (it is hard to imagine Europe developing its shield without drawing its inspiration from the American systems) as well as the deployment of such a defense by the signatory countries on territories other than their own. Finally, Moscow could easily contend that the technology of "theater" defense could equally be applied to ballistic missiles and that this would accordingly violate at least the spirit of the treaty.

In short, one can already gauge the complexity of the political debate--a debate that has scarcely begun--that will be provoked by a European antimissile defense initiative.

Easier Than the American Version?

It takes only a few minutes for the Soviet missiles to reach Western Europe. Is a defense system capable of intercepting them therefore conceivable? It would seem so, according to the experts, and--some of them add--even before the American SDI program itself is operational. The European system would in fact be based essentially on land rather than in space. In the initial phase it would not resort to directed energy, lasers and the like (which are difficult to use in the atmosphere) but would involve very rapid, ultrasophisticated defense missiles.

A European SDI would accordingly respond to precise strategic requirements that need to be examined at the very outset, because these requirements determine the highly specific character of such a system.

If some strategists believe they can one day provide Europe with a protective "roof," it is primarily for the purpose of providing a counterbalance vis-a-vis the USSR. Some Atlantic Pact circles fear that the Soviet Union is in a position to win a limited war in Europe; the ever-increasing number of its short- and medium-range missiles--weapons which are themselves increasingly accurate--would give it the advantage in a so-called "theater" confrontation. These circles are therefore afraid they will be placed on the horns of a dilemma, namely: surrender, or launch a suicidal nuclear war.

Protect Strategic Points

An antimissile shield could offer an alternative to that cruel choice. "An attack against a specific objective or region in Europe offers, at the present time, an almost complete certainty of success short of a failure of the attack system itself," writes David S. Sorenson. (Footnote 1) (Political scientist, Denison University, Ohio, United States, in CURRENT NEWS, Oct 1985, Department of Defense) "If this degree of certainty could be reduced by even--let us say--50 percent, confidence in the success of the attack would be considerably reduced."

It would be a question, moreover, not of protecting all of Europe--at least not in the initial phase--but only of protecting precise areas such as airports, ports, nuclear sites, and munitions depots. A credible defense of

essential strategic points would ensure a response capability; it would therefore make a first strike prohibitively hazardous and would to that extent dissuade the potential enemy.

A limited antimissile defense of this nature is, moreover, easier to achieve. It is a question of protecting only those cones through which the enemy's missiles must pass in order to reach their particular targets, whereas a defense of the entire territory would necessitate systems of detection, communication, data processing, and response that are much more extensive and sophisticated. It would also require the capability of destroying enemy missiles at several levels (at launch, in mid-flight, and at the end of the flight)--something that in the case of short- or medium-range missiles can hardly be expected to exist for another 20 years.

But even when reduced to a few nerve centers, an antimissile defense is conditioned by the nature of the challenge. It is estimated that it would take an advanced Soviet missile between 3 and 12 minutes to reach its target in Europe. Contrary to the situation with the American space defense, this would not allow the European defense either a missed shot or a second shot; one would have to strike swiftly and accurately. Many of these missiles are mobile, and this would further complicate the detection of their launching and determination of their trajectory. The American SDI system of observation satellites, detection, and even intervention could undoubtedly provide support, in any case, to assist in combating the relatively long-range missiles such as the SS 20's, whose trajectory attains a considerable altitude.

However, most of the missiles capable of reaching Western Europe--the so-called tactical missiles--do not leave the atmosphere. They fly swiftly and at low altitude. The fact is that in the atmosphere, lasers are powerless and particle guns are slowed down--a difficulty that will, it is believed, take 5 to 10 years to overcome.

The plan is therefore to employ missiles rather than directed energy--missiles that are, moreover, almost available for use. AEROSPATIALE has, for example, just introduced a ground-to-air missile--the Aster--which is capable of destroying aircraft and missiles. In particular, the plan calls for equipping these missiles with infrared sensors or electrooptic systems that would enable them to detect their target and to distinguish it from possible decoys that would accompany it.

Tactical missiles are in fact easier to detect and to follow than ballistic missiles. The friction of the atmosphere causes them to leave a perceptible trail. They cannot transport many decoys easily. They are also less resistant than the ballistic missiles, which are reinforced in order to penetrate the atmosphere at high speed.

It remains an open question whether the defensive missiles should or should not be equipped with nuclear warheads, which make for less precision in firing; but they are politically less acceptable. It is at least conceivable, inasmuch as it is a question of destroying relatively "large" missiles such as the SS 20's and of causing the impact to take place during their ascending phase, that is to say, over Soviet territory.

Be that as it may, the technologies necessary for the construction of a selective European antimissile shield appear to be within reach. A number of firms are impatient to be able to get started with the project. In Europe, however, the political decision--even in the case of a relatively simple system--is proving to be more sensitive than it seems to be in the United States, in the case of a clearly more complex system.

10992
CSO: 5200/2591

SALT/START ISSUES

USSR HITS U.S. ACCUSATIONS OF TREATY VIOLATIONS

Secret Report Undermines Agreement

LD081317 Moscow TASS in English 1205 GMT 8 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 8 TASS -- TASS correspondent Igor Makurin reports:

U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has again appeared in the role of one of the main opponents of the normalisation of relations with the Soviet Union and of the establishment of control over arms. THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper reports that the Pentagon chief has sent another secret report to the White House. In the report he suggests taking a number of steps which would undermine the earlier reached and current agreements with the Soviet Union in the field of arms. In particular, by using unfounded accusations levelled at the USSR for alleged violations of international obligations, he insists that the United States should not dismantle two "Poseidon" nuclear-powered submarines after two "Trident" missile-carrying submarines are launched. The newspaper points out that this is obviously in conflict with the SALT-2 Treaty provisions.

Besides, the Pentagon chief recommends that the President replace some "Minuteman-2" single-warhead missiles with "Minuteman-3" missiles which carry three warheads. The United States would thus add multiple-warhead missiles, further exceeding the treaty limit, the newspaper writes.

The U.S. defence secretary also suggests that the United States encode signals sent by missiles during tests to deny the Soviet Union information about the tests. Such information is provided for by the above-mentioned treaty. He also calls for stepping up research on biological and chemical weapons.

According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, Weinberger's recommendations have given rise to concern even among many administration officials who not without reason regard the step made by him as yet another attempt at destroying the SALT-2 treaty.

U.S. Officials Cited

LD092307 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1545 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, 9 January (TASS) — As has become known from materials which have just been published about private hearings of the U.S. Congress, informed employees of the Washington Administration have repeatedly admitted in their testimony that the

Soviet Union observes the conditions of agreements signed by it on weapons control. Their statements openly refute the unsubstantiated assertions contained in a number of official administration "reports" to Congress, about some kind of "violations" by the Soviet Union of its international obligations. The fact of the Soviet Union's observance of treaties was confirmed, in particular, by Ambassador Richard Ellis -- the U.S. representative on the Soviet-American permanent consultative commission, a body officially established to check the observance by the sides of agreements concluded. As reported by THE WASHINGTON TIMES, general John Chain, former director of the State Department bureau of military and political affairs, gave similar evidence at private hearings.

U.S. Violating 'Commitments'

LD101114 Moscow TASS in English 1009 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 10 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes: Unlike the hare in the children's fairytale "Alice in Wonderland", which would grow inordinately excited and talk driveling nonsense with the coming of March, U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger falls into a comparable state somewhat earlier, and that is just as U.S. Congress is about to debate a military budget.

Year in and year out, the Pentagon chief at such time would be digging deep into a hat to produce the most fantastic concoctions about a "Soviet military threat", all designed to give the law-makers a scare and secure another increase in spending on war preparations.

In a report for the U.S. Carnegie Foundation, which Pentagon officials said was the administration's first salvo in a blitz to push through its budget for the next fiscal year, Weinberger demanded that the legislators think better of any cuts in the requested military appropriations of 281.2 billion dollars. He claimed that any trimming of the Pentagon budget would put a question mark over the U.S. ability to successfully negotiate with the Soviet Union.

The defense secretary, who several days ago urged the White House to renounce compliance with the SALT-2 treaty, then suddenly started displaying unusual concern for the observance of international agreements, by branding the USSR with fabricated charges of "treaty violations".

This time, however, he could find no better example of a "violation" than the long-disproved invention about the Soviet Union deploying a second new intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

As is known, the Soviet side has long provided the United States with incontrovertible evidence that what the Pentagon calls the SS-25 is really a version of the earlier ICBM RS-12 [as received] which has been modernized within the limits set by SALT-2.

The Pentagon chief came forward with his latest statements on SALT-2 and allegations about the Soviet Union's "failure to comply with" agreements not only to raise more funds for military purposes. He also was obviously intent on justifying the U.S.'s glaring violations of its treaty-based commitments and vindicating Washington's policy of crawling out of agreements that interfere with its plans to achieve military superiority.

Weinberger Undermining Treaty

LD101146 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] While the White House has rolled up its sleeves for a bout with what they call international terrorism, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger is working quietly but persistently to undermine the Soviet-American SALT II treaty.

A secret report by Mr Weinberger recommends violation of the SALT II treaty by not dismantling two Poseidon nuclear subs when a new Trident sub goes to sea later this year. If the Poceidons are not dismantled, the Trident's number of missile-launching tubes would put the United States over the launcher ceiling of SALT II.

To violate a U.S.-Soviet treaty there has to be some justification. Preparations for the violation began last year when the Pentagon produced a report charging the Soviet Union with various treaty violations. It is a familiar pattern, and a predictable one; in fact so predictable that serious arms control experts accuse the White House of falsifying evidence. A column to this effect appeared, though belatedly, in THE NEW YORK TIMES 5 days ago. It said in part that, in a desperate effort to have a consensus on alleged Soviet violations, the Pentagon and the White House ended up in mush. Nevertheless, armed with mush as evidence, the American secretary of defense is adament in opposing compliance with the unratified treaty.

Before the November summit in Geneva details of his letter to President Reagan became known. In that letter Caspar Weinberger was against American compliance with SALT II and against any moves that could harm the "star wars" program; but as if all this were not enough, it became known that the latest doctrine of the U.S. Navy provides for a number of things. It provides an eloquent answer to those Americans who believe their government is interested in arms control; and secondly, attacks on the treaty provide some clues as to how the public is brainwashed through the free and independent media. One honest article in THE NEW YORK TIMES calling anti-Soviet charges mush is outnumbered by thousands of statements on radio and television, speeches before various audiences, and articles in newspapers and magazines where that same mush is used as a serious argument.

USSR Complying Treaties

LD120557 Moscow TASS in English 0006 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 10 TASS -- THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper has reported that declassified materials of the U.S. Congress on matters of Soviet-American relations have been published in Washington. The materials were discussed at closed-door hearings last year.

Speaking in one of the Senate committees, General John T. Chain, the then director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs in the State Department, said that, in the opinion of the U.S. State Department, the Soviet Union" has complied with the provisions" of all treaties and agreements on the limitation of arms. He urged the administration to observe the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty as any attempts by the USA to violate them would only lead to a fresh spiral in the offensive nuclear arms race.

In this connection THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that the viewpoint of the State Department contradicts the stand of the Pentagon which continues to assert up to this date the USSR's non-compliance with the treaty obligations.

Particular zeal in spreading such kind of falsehoods about the Soviet Union's policy is being shown by U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and his assistant Richard Perle who does everyting necessary to put new arms programmes through Congress and to undermine the now existing approximate strategic balance.

The newspaper writes that Perle at the selfsame hearings urged the USA to abandon the observance of the SALT-2 treaty since the treaty is ostensibly of benefit only to the Soviet Union.

The assistant to the Pentagon chief also objected to the USA's dismantling the "Poseidon" submarine after yet another "Trident" missile-carrying submarine will be phased into service. This, according to the State Department, will become a direct violation of the SALT-2 treaty. Then the Reagan administration is known to have decided, for its own considerations, to give up Perle's advice.

However, as the newspaper points out, the issue has reemerged again when it became known that a new "Trident" submarine will be launched in May as well as in the light of the on-going deployment of cruise missiles on strategic bombers. All this, the newspaper maintains, will push the United States over a treaty limit.

Weinberger's Remarks Hit

LD122259 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 13 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has made another unseemly attempt at questioning the Soviet Union's policy in the cause of observance of its international treaty obligations. Speaking in an ABC programme, he unfoundedly accused the USSR of alleged violations of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty. The U.S. defence secretary needed all that to divert the attention of the public from the efforts being made by the administration to sabotage the treaty provisions and to justify the development and deployment of new first-strike nuclear missiles MX and Midgetman.

Charges Termed 'Fabrications'

LD131613 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1518 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] New York, 13 Jan (TASS) -- U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger has made another unseemly attempt to cast a slur on the Soviet Union's policy as regards observance of the international treaty obligations it has assumed. Speaking on an ABC television program, he accused the USSR, for the umpteeth time, of allegedly "violating" the SALT II treaty. In particular, the secretary alleged that the Soviet Union had begun developing [razrabotka] "a new type of intercontinental ballistic missile", even though he is well aware that the missile involved is merely an updated version of the existing RS-12 [as received], and that such modernization, within specific limits, is not banned by the SALT II treaty. Weinberger also distorted the very content of the

treaty, declaring that it allegedly does not provide for any reduction in strategic offensive weapons, that it is allegedly advantageous only for the Soviet Union, and that the United States -- so he said -- made a serious mistake in concluding the treaty. At the same time, the Pentagon boss did not utter a word about the fact that in the event of ratification of the treaty by the United States, the Soviet Union would cut the number of its strategic carriers alone by 10 percent.

The chief of the U.S. military department needed the other part of his fabrications to distract public attention away from the efforts being made by the Washington administration to sabotage the provisions of the SALT II treaty and justify the creation and deployment of two new intercontinental ballistic missiles -- MX and Midgetman -- something which is banned by the treaty.

The chief of the U.S. military department also reported that, at present, the administration is discussing measures which should be taken in response to these fabricated "violations" by the Soviet Union.

Weinberger himself presented the President with a secret report containing his ideas and recommendations on the SALT II treaty. As ABC points out, in this document the secretary urgently calls for the "Poseidon" nuclear submarines not to be dismantled after the "Trident" submarine missile carriers have been launched although that would mean a violation of the SALT II treaty. According to THE NEW YORK TIMES, in this report the Pentagon chief also recommended that the President replace "Minuteman-2" missiles with one warhead by "Minuteman-3" MIRVs. In that case, stresses the paper, the number of MIRVs belonging to the United States would exceed the limits established by the SALT II Treaty.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1226

SALT/START ISSUES

BRIEFS

USSR: U.S. TESTS MIDGETMAN--The United States has carried out the first tests of the targeting system of its intercontinental ballistic Midgetman missile. The Pentagon intends to order 500 Midgetman missiles whose worth will total $40 billion. The weapons are to be sited by the end of the decade. The Midgetman is a totally new, mobile version of intercontinental ballistic missiles. By developing it, the United States undermines its SALT II agreement with the Soviet Union. [Text] [Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 24 Dec 85 LD] /9274

TASS ON PENTAGON'S D-5 PLANS--New York, 2 Jan (TASS)--This year the Pentagon is planning to start the deployment of new D-5 ballistic missiles of enhanced accuracy on Trident nuclear-powered missile-carrying submarines. This has been reported by the Chicago SUN TIMES newspaper. Congressman Ted Weiss has stated in this connection that the C-4 missile which is now in service with the U.S. submarine fleet is capable of destroying whole towns. The missile's power is 80 percent less than that of the D-5 which is carrying eight warheads. The lawmaker has stated with concern that the deployment of D-5 missiles will increase still more the nuclear conflict danger which hangs over mankind and will destabilize the military-political situation in the world. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 2 Jan 86 LD] /9274

TASS CITES SENATOR KENNEDY--New York, 22 Dec (TASS)--Senator Edward Kennedy has declared in favour of observing the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty even after it expires on 31 December. In an article published in the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES, the senator stresses that leaving in force the provisions of that treaty, which has never been ratified by the U.S. Senate, is "very much in our nation's security interests." On top of that, Edward Kennedy said, that "The Geneva negotiations will receive a considerable boost" by the continuing observance of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 22 Dec 85 LD] /9274

CSO: 5200/1226

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW CLAIMS U.S. CHEATING ON NUMBER OF EUROMISSILES

LD091818 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Aleksandr Druzhinin commentary]

[Text] According to the American press the United States has deployed 156 Pershing II missiles in West Germany and not 108 as it formally announced. The Pentagon claims the extra 48 missiles belong to its reserves and therefore it will not count them in estimating the overall nuclear balance. More on this from Aleksandr Druzhinin, who writes:

It is not the first time Washington is cheating on the number of its missiles. When NATO was deciding in 1979 to deploy new American missiles in Western Europe the Pentagon secretly planned to install two instead of one on every launchpad. Now that West Germany has already accepted its share of Pershings the Americans are siting cruise missiles in the country. The first have arrived at a military base near Hasselbach.

Washington is trying to justify its dangerous moves by claiming a Soviet military threat. But who would take this claim seriously if the Soviet Union is known to steadily campaign for ridding Europe of all nuclear weapons? To this end this country has said it would not toughen its countermeasures were the United States to stop deploying Pershing II's and cruises in Western Europe. What is more, it has unilaterally reduced medium-range missiles in its European regions. At the moment there are as many as in June 1984. The SS-20's deployed since then have been removed from operational duty and their launchpads dismantled.

The Soviet Union believes it would be impossible to solve the problem of intermediate-range forces without throwing the British and French nuclear forces into the bargain. For this reason, it calls for discussing this in direct talks with the two countries. With the USSR exercising self-restraint its position is realistic enough to help defuse the dangerous confrontation resulting from European nuclear missiles. Yet the United States responds by siting more and more Euromissiles. That means it wants not to bring about nuclear disarmament but to gain unilateral advantages and create a first strike potential.

The American missiles may be trained on the socialist countries but they might, as well, reach the Middle East, North Africa and some other regions. Notably, the Americans are planning to site 30 Pershing II's on their own territory in order to move them promptly, as they put it, to any part of the world in the event of a crisis. The Euromissiles may pose an added threat, considering the dangerous role assigned by the Americans to their military base of Comiso on Sicily, in their aggressive schemes against Libya.

America's Euromissiles obviously threaten many countries. This threat can be eliminated only by stopping the race in nuclear missiles.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

MOSCOW CONTRASTS SOVIET, NATO DISARMAMENT INITIATIVES

LD180106 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 17 Dec 85

[Konstantin Sorokin commentary]

[Text] The Soviet-American summit last month again drew the attention of the world public to the need for an immediate settlement of the main problems of limiting and reducing armaments. It showed that speedy progress can be made in spheres where the sides have points of similarity--for example, in such an important sphere for all European nations as the reduction of intermediate-range weapons in Europe.

The final joint statement of the summit said that an interim agreement could be reached on medium-range missiles in Europe. The prospects of finally finding a way out of (?a) situation fraught with further complications appeared largely thanks to a Soviet (?initiative) [passage indistinct] missiles in the European zone. At the beginning of last October it declared that the number of new SS-20 missiles had been reduced to the level of June 1984, when additional missiles were stationed to counteract the NATO rearmament program. By last October the additional SS-20's had been taken off from active service. The regular procedures for their deployment were supposed to be dismantled in 2 months; 2 months have passed and the promise has been kept.

This was confirmed a few days ago by the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev at a meeting with the chairman of the French National Assembly. Now the USSR has less carrier missiles in Europe than 10 or 15 years ago. It is also important to single out another step taken by the Soviet leadership. At the beginning of last October the Soviet Union proposed an agreement on intermediate-range missiles to the United States outside the context of strategic and space armaments. Simultaneously it proposed direct talks with Britain and France on their nuclear weapons in order to find an acceptable way out through joint efforts.

Such are the initiatives of the Soviet Union, but NATO initiatives are aimed in the opposite direction. According to the West German magazine DER SPIEGEL, in view of the Geneva summit the Pentagon hastily completed the stationing of all the 108 launching pads for Pershing II missiles. On 19 November, on the first day of the talks, more cruise missiles arrived in Greenham Common. This NATO policy is not accidental. It is not an annoying

episode, because it continues now that the political outcome of the Geneva dialogue has to be carried out into life. Last week's session of the NATO Council in Brussels proved that. The majority of the NATO countries spoke for the continuation of the deployment of new American missiles ahead of schedule.

But is it possible to count on success at the talks on the limitation of missiles and simultaneously increase their numbers? In this connection, it is appropriate to recall the speech made by the Secretary of State, Shultz, at the session. He called for removing the nuclear weapons of Britain and France from the agenda of talks with the Soviet Union. But this potential exists. Both countries are located in Europe, and consequently their nuclear potentials are an inseparable part of the European balance of forces. Besides, London and Paris are steadily increasing their nuclear arsenals. After the recent modernization the number of warheads on British Polaris missiles has doubled and has almost reached 400 units. In the future, with the purchase of the overseas Trident system, the number of British warheads on submarine-launched ballistic missiles will grow to over 500. Being capable of individual homing, they will be able to hit 8 times more targets than the missiles Britain has today.

The American Secretary of State cannot be serious in suggesting that the Soviet Union should simply turn a blind eye on the existence of the British and French nuclear forces--that is to say, if he really wants to reach a mutually acceptable solution. Against the background of the past few years the Geneva summit undoubtedly was a new phase in Soviet-American and East-West relations. But the political results reached at it require new initiatives. The Soviet Union has demonstrated flexibility and the desire to take the approaches of partners into account and is ready to do so in the future. But the other side should also view things from a new angle. The preservation of old approaches that have proved unrealistic and the repetition of groundless charges can only hinder progress.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

IZVESTIYA VIEWS DIALOGUE ON NETHERLANDS MISSILES

PM101157 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Political observer Stanislav Kondrashov article: "Importance of Dialogue"]

[Text] Among the important unresolved problems that the new year has inherited from the old there remains the problem of nuclear arms in Europe -- and the task of lowering nuclear confrontation on the continent, which is not called a nuclear powder keg for nothing. If we take the dynamics of "missile" figures, last year revealed two opposing trends. The Soviet Union first announced a moratorium on the deployment of new SS-20 missiles which had been additionally deployed in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in West Europe. As a result of that reduction, the number of SS-20 (243 in all) in the European zone was reduced to the level that existed in June 1984. The stationary structures for the deployment of the missiles removed were dismantled.

On the other side -- the U.S. and NATO side -- the curve rose steadily last year. According to official Pentagon data, today 236 American medium-range nuclear missiles are deployed in West Europe, including all 108 of the Pershing-2's envisaged by NATO's "two-track decision" of December 1979. And, as is well known, Britain and France also have their own nuclear missiles.

As is known, this very acute European political problem was on the agenda of the Soviet-American talks that started in Geneva last March and are soon to be resumed. Unfortunately, no real progress toward an accord was registered. Some hope is now pinned on the Geneva summit meeting. In the Soviet-American joint statement on its results, the sides advocated that the speediest progress be made in those spheres where there are points of contact, mentioning here this idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

The Soviet Union has done a great deal to breathe new life into these talks and to give them the prospect of a successful outcome. Let us recall that Soviet foreign policy initiatives last year included a proposal to conclude an agreement on the question of nuclear arms in Europe separately, with no direct link to the problem of space and strategic arms. In its search for a solution to the problem the Soviet Union also invited Britain and France to a direct conversation in order to discuss, taking mutual interests into account, the place of their nuclear potential in the European balance of forces.

Only unscrupulous people or the most inveterate skeptics could cast doubt on the sincerity and intensiveness of the Soviet efforts to pursue the aim of lessening the

danger of war in Europe. We invite everyone to a constructive dialogue, proceeding from the premise that Europe is our common home. We are prepared to give everyone a hearing. And in the context of the Soviet peace-loving effort the question of reciprocity, of movement toward the West European states, and of the participation in and contribution of each of them to resolving the common task of improving the international and European situation is arising with ever greater urgency.

I would like to dwell on the attitude of the Netherlands and its government to this dialogue.

The Netherlands resisted the missile deployment plans longer than the others. According to the NATO plan drawn up back at the end of 1979, 48 American cruise missiles were "put down" to this small country, but a country proud of its independent character. The Dutch spent 6 years fighting the plans off. The population was opposed to "defenders" who attract nuclear danger like a magnet. The government could not disregard the will of the people, who, as polls showed, rejected the transatlantic gifts by approximately two-thirds of the adult population's votes and appended approximately 4 million signatures to corresponding petitions -- an unprecedented knot of protest for a country with 14 million inhabitants.

Since the Dutch so clearly preferred common sense to the fetish of blind Atlantic solidarity, the right-centrist coalition government of R. Lubbers long delayed the moment of decision, despite pressure from the senior NATO partner. However, outside pressure still overcame protest within the country. On 1 November 1985 the government nonetheless adopted the regrettable decision to deploy American missiles. Parliament is now debating the question of an American-Dutch agreement on this score, and the debate is expected to end in a few weeks. Toward the end of 1988 American Tomahawks will arrive at an air base near the small town of Woensdrecht.

Trying to substantiate the missile decision, Prime Minister R. Lubbers voiced the opinion that his government's policy, "in the form in which it was pursued, at a certain level and to a certain degree, had a positive impact on the international climate." He added: "We managed to avoid escalation," Permit me to ask: What escalation? Does not consent to the deployment of American missiles in the Netherlands mean the escalation both of military confrontation in Europe and, correspondingly, of the danger of war?!

Of course, the dogged resistance of the Dutch to the dangerous plans was noted and assessed, but their government's contribution to improving the European situation would have been incontestable if it had not been hasty over the American missiles, had made better use of the potential of the Dutch-Soviet dialogue, and had made a constructive assessment of the qualitatively new situation created by the broad package of Soviet proposals which open the way to a substantial reduction in medium-range nuclear means in Europe.

We have already mentioned an important new element of the Soviet proposals -- the idea of concluding a separate agreement on these arms, independently of space and strategic arms.

The Dutch side made it a condition for refunding American missiles that the number of Soviet missiles should not rise above the June 1984 level. The Soviet Union took that condition into consideration with regard to the European zone, and that at a time when the number of similar American means in West Europe had more than quadrupled.

Did that not merit corresponding attention on the part of The Hague?

True, in defining the conditions for adopting the decision on the American Tomahawks, the Lubbers government also raised the question of Soviet missiles in Asia. However, that question was dragged up artificially. It has no bearing on the Eurostrategic balance or the Netherlands' security interests. The Soviet Union neither had nor has any intention of transferring the missiles removed from the European zone to the Asian part. In addition, in order to remain within the framework of their chosen logic, the Dutch leaders could have extended their concern over the mobility of the SS-20 missile also to the American Pershings and Tomahawks. Because they are no less mobile, and if, as skeptics believe, Soviet missiles are being kept in Asia for instantaneous transfer, if necessary, to Europe, then why not -- according to the same logic and for the same purpose -- keep American missiles on the other side of the ocean?

The unrealistic, inflexible conditions formulated by The Hague in June 1984 proved to be a kind of delayed-action ultimatum which the Netherlands Government issued to itself and fulfilled on 1 November last year. Then some people in The Hague evidently decided to consider the dialogue between our two countries closed. Meanwhile, the favorable opportunities for it have by no means been exhausted. At any rate, Moscow advocates maintaining a serious dialogue with the Netherlands on questions of security and medium-range nuclear means in Europe. Particularly now, after the agreement reached at the highest level in Geneva that work at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms will be accelerated, it is important not to be hasty over adopting decisions that might not improve but worsen the prospects for reaching mutually acceptable accords. It is important to continue the search for mutual understanding.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

NETHERLANDS STANCE ON NUCLEAR ISSUES EXAMINED BY PRAVDA

PM081645 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Drobkov "International Notes": "The Netherlands on a NATO Leash"]

[Text] The Hague, -- In recent weeks the Netherlands has again felt the sharp tug of the NATO leash. The leadership of the North Atlantic bloc and a number of its most bellicose members have declared their dissatisfaction with the country's behavior.

What is it that has so upset the North Atlanticists who only recently applauded the decision by R. Lubbers' right-centrist cabinet to accept the new U.S. nuclear missiles on the Netherlands soil in 1988? What caused the displeasure in NATO was the Netherlands government's declared intention to ensure that the country is relieved of some of its nuclear tasks.

In return for its concession to the NATO militarists in accepting the medium-range missiles, R. Lubbers' cabinet expressed a desire to renounce its commitment to maintaining two squadrons of F-16 aircraft, armed with nuclear bombs and missiles, and 13 orion aircraft with nuclear depth charges on board. The F-16's have the job of "defending" northern areas of the FRG and the Orions, and in the even of conflicts, would ensure NATO superiority in sea lanes in the North Sea. It is the Netherlands' aim that the F-16's and Orions should carry only conventional weapons.

Thus, ruling forces were hoping to sweeten the missile pill and stem the continuing protest movement. At the same time, the Netherlands Government was hoping somehow to reinforce its assurances that it wants to curb the nuclear arms race in Europe. Finally, by taking this step the parties of the ruling coalition intended to facilitate parliamentary approval of the U.S. missile agreement. As is known, the plans for the deployment of cruise missiles here have been criticized by some deputies from the ruling majority as well as by the democratic opposition parties.

But the NATO leadership preferred not to give the Netherlands the slightest hope of a possible curtailment of its nuclear role. There were harsh words from Brussels in the shape of a special message from the NATO secretary general.

General B. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander Europe, was dispatched post haste to the Hague. Addressing the local Atlanctic committee assembly, the U.S. general categorically rejected efforts to reduce the number of nuclear tasks.

According to him, such an action could set a dangerous precedent for NATO. Moreover, in accordance with the bloc's nuclear strategy, the U.S. general explained, in the event

of a conflict as many allies as possible would join in or, in other words, share common responsibility for using nuclear weapons. The deployment of the new nuclear missiles in the Netherlands, B. Rogers tried to demonstrate, in no way releases the country from its other commitments.

The general's revelations placed R. Lubbers in a very awkward position. Apparently, the NATO supreme commander can publicly repudiate statements by the government of a member country. This unceremonious behavior has graphically demonstrated the state of relations within the North Atlantic bloc.

The incident involving the message from Brussels and the general's pronouncements in The Hague have created definite tension in the Netherlands relations with NATO. The tension was confirmed at the recent sessions of the bloc's leading bodies. During the Brussels "winter Atlantic marathon" the Netherlands representatives were subjected to new pressure both by NATO officials, headed by the bloc's Secretary General Lord Carrington and by the heads of a number of allies' military and diplomatic departments.

The attacks on the Netherlands position were sharpest at the meeting of NATO military ministers. The Brussels paper LE SOIR wrote that NATO had "launched an assault on the Netherlands windmills," and the Netherlands Defense Minister J. de Ruiter was placed "in the dock" by the allies.

Representatives of three Netherlands parliamentary commissions are to go to NATO headquarters in Brussels soon. The newspaper NRC HANDELSBLAD reported that they would be holding "informal consultations" with the bloc leadership on various aspects of fulfillment of the missile decision. This also concerns problems pertaining to the reduction of nuclear tasks. A number of parties represented in parliament refused to send their representatives on these commissions to Brussels since they said that NATO's actions patently demonstrate that parliament will not be given the chance to "clarify the situation" during these consultations. The paper ALGEMEEN DAGBLAD noted that the allies "will not have the slightest inclination to review the agreements" on the Netherlands' nuclear tasks.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

TASS: FRG PUBLIC PROTESTS PERSHING-2 DEPLOYMENT

LD101805 Moscow TASS in English 1748 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy writes:

The Ministry of Defence of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) officially announced today that a special commission of the U.S. Army has completed the investigation of the causes of the incident with the first-strike nuclear missile "Pershing-2" which had taken place at Waldheide Base near the city of Heilbronn a year ago. A powerful explosion is known to have occurred owing to the self-actuation of the missile's motor. As a result of the explosion, three U.S. soldiers were killed and sixteen seriously injured. Only by good fortune the incident with the "Pershing-2" missile did not lead to truly fatal consequences. The fire that blazed out could spread over to the near-by storage of other missiles as well as of nuclear warheads for them.

The incident in Heilbronn gave rise to protests among the FRG's peace-loving public who demanded that the Waldheide military base be wound up and that the U.S. first-strike nuclear-missile systems which had been deployed contrary to the will of an overwhelming majority of the country's population be removed. The Heilbronn authorities also joined in the protests.

The U.S. military in every way sought to hush up the incident with the nuclear missile and to downplay the wave of protests against the conversion of the FRG's territory into a launching site for nuclear death. The notorious "investigation" which has been announced by Bonn's Defence Ministry is obviously subordinated to those goals: The investigation has ostensibly confirmed that it was a question of only an ordinary "technical malfunction".

Meanwhile the deployment of "Pershing-2" missiles in the FRG's territory has been fully completed. The Pentagon, with the consent of the ruling circles of the FRG, has started siting nuclear-tipped cruise missiles on West German soil. According to the land organisation of the Greens Party, all the cruise missiles intended for being sited in West Germany are already in the FRG, and not one cruise missile. They were secretly brought into the country half a year ago.

The ongoing conversion of the FRG's territory into the USA's and NATO's nuclear missile staging area has given rise to a wave of indignation among the public.

The peace campaigners of Rhine-Hunsrueck-Mosel District have issued a statement demanding that the deployment of cruise missiles be immediately stopped and that the already deployed first-strike nuclear-missile systems be removed. "The deployment of missiles is being carried out contrary to the will of an overwhelming majority of our country's population," the statement stresses.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

SOVIET COMMENTATORS VIEW FRG STANCE ON MISSILE STATIONING

Grigoryev in PRAVDA

PM131233 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Yevgeniy Grigoryev "Commentator's Column": "Lack of Restraint"]

[Text] Certain well known circles in the United States and the FRG are marking UN Peace Year in their own particular way. They began it by delivering new U.S. cruise missiles to the Bonn state.

However, this is not simply the "planned implementation" of the notorious U.S.-NATO nuclear "arms upgrading" program. It concerns the FRG -- the only NATO country whose government has allowed it to be turned into a launchpad for Pershing-2 missiles, which pose a special threat to peace in Europe. According to information in the American NATIONAL JOURNAL, 156 such detonators of nuclear catastrophe have been delivered to the FRG: 108 in accordance with the NATO decision, the rest as "spares." With the Pershing-2 installation completed in December, a new round in the nuclear arms race is thus being started on FRG territory now, by larding it with cruise missiles.

Of course, the Pentagon's pointing finger is clearly visible in this pursuit of the illusion of military superiority. What are ruling circles in Bonn doing? They are good at paying lip service to the campaign for an end to the arms race, for restraint, and so forth. Listening to some Bonn figures you would think that the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva would not even have taken place but for their efforts? But the Bonn government's practical actions are quite different. When neighboring countries propose, for example, discussing the question of creating a chemical weapon-free zone, people on the Rhine "swamp" the good deed in a flood of excuses. But when it comes to "arms upgrading" or an adventurist undertaking like the "star wars" program, Bonn's support is assured.

As a result the FRG, from which its leaders assure us the threat of war must never arise again, is increasingly sinking beneath mountains of weapons, among them the most dangerous weapons for peace and the peoples' future.

The Soviet Union has made many earnest efforts to break the deadlock in resolving the question of medium-range missiles in Europe. Our new constructive proposals on this score are well known. It is gratifying to note that the idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe is one area at the Soviet-U.S. summit where there were "points of contact."

It is easy to see that the continued buildup of those weapons can only make it harder to put this idea into effect. That is the aim of the Pentagon and the U.S. military-industrial complex, which are now leading the attack against the Geneva meeting's results. Is Bonn in agreement with this, then?

However, it is precisely now after Geneva that political wisdom more than ever before demands circumspection and restraint: It demands not the complication of an already difficult situation but, on the contrary, the comprehensive promotion of the prospects for implementing the Geneva accords. The FRG could make a constructive contribution here. But the question is -- does Bonn have the corresponding political will and good will?

The FRG public undoubtedly has that will. This was shown once more by the protest demonstration that greeted the cruise missiles. The peoples demand a halt to the further deployment of medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe. People of good will resolutely urge that it be reduced and eliminated in the interests of peace and security in Europe. And they do not intend to slacken that struggle.

Aksyonov Comments

LD101156 Moscow TASS in English 1155 GMT 10 Jan 86

["Cruise Missiles Arrive at Hann Base" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 10 TASS -- TASS commentator Lev Aksyonov writes:

The first American cruise missile out of the 96 to be deployed on West German soil under the December 1979 "double-track decision" by NATO arrived in the FRG. The ARD TV network, reporting the event, noted that this first-strike weapon would be deployed at the American base Hann.

Certain West German officials noted in their statements, not without satisfaction, that the NATO schedule of deploying new missiles was kept with meticulous accuracy.

However, if those who toe the Washington administration's line might feel some satisfaction, the same hardly goes for the millions of ordinary West Germans who hold a diametrically opposite stand on the "missile issue." On the same day when the missile was delivered to the FRG, there was a mass demonstration in Haselbach, near which the base is situated, protesting the escalation of the race of nuclear missile weapons.

Sober-minded politicians and public figures in the FRG point out with alarm that the security of West Germany, which already has 108 Pershing-2 missiles on its territory, is undermined.

Even if one would not endeavor to predict the deadly consequences, with which the realisation of NATO missile decisions is fraught for the FRG in the event of a military confrontation, the presence of such weaponry in peacetime poses a real danger to the life of the citizens themselves. Since the beginning of the deployment of Pershing-2 missiles, there were several accidents involving these missiles which could result in disaster. Now that the cruise missiles begin to be sited, this danger increases even more.

Levin on Missiles

LD140932 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] DPA has reported on a speech by Todenhoefer, a representative of the CDU/CSU faction in the FRG Bundestag. He alleged that none of the preceding FRG governments did as much to limit arms as the present one. The statement is not simply dubious, but completely unjustified. It is precisely under the present government that the deployment of U.S. Pershing-2 first-strike nuclear missiles on the territory of the FRG started and has already been completed. And cruise missiles, too, began to arrive last week. A total of 96 of them are planned to be deployed in the FRG. The general public of the country is resolutely protesting against FRG being turned into a base for U.S. nuclear death. The antiwar organizations are planning to carry out mass demonstrations; discontent is growing in force. Is that not the cause of Todenhoefer's duplicitous speech? I ask my colleague Viktor Levin to answer that question.

[Levin] I would say that that is one of the causes; to deceive public opinion, to mislead the citizens of the FRG. This is the aim which Todenhoefer is pursuing, and not only in the aforementioned speech. According to the official table of ranks, Todenhoefer is considered to be the spokesman of the CDU/CSU faction on the question of disarmament, but all his efforts are directed toward a continuation and strengthening of armaments, the fostering of tension. Todenhoefer does not hold back when it comes to ways and means. Even such a blatant lie as the claim about the actions of the FRG Government in pursuit of disarmament is not the peak of his fabrications. He knows no shame in his attempts to deceive the general public. And after all, it is precisely the present cabinet that is marked by its unquestioning, not to say servile, following of the most dangerous of Washington's ventures. The FRG has offered its territory for U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles and supported the "star wars" program.

On the other hand, in all sorts of ways Bonn is avoiding answering the concrete proposals from the GDR and Czechoslovakia to start talks on the creation of a chemical weapons free zone in Central Europe. But according to Todenhoefer, it would appear that Bonn entertains no thoughts other than to promote disarmament. But after all, policies are judged not by words, but by deeds.

At the same time, in talking about the beginning of the deployment of cruise missiles in the FRG -- the first arrived last Thursday, and soon the others will follow -- I would not like to pin all the responsibility on the Bonn government.

It is guilty of complicity. But the actual authorship of these actions, dangerous for the cause of peace, belongs to the United States -- and these actions are not simply dangerous; but, in the present circumstances, provocative, too. Judge for yourselves. The Soviet Union has made concrete, and very far-reaching proposals on medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe. To start with, our country, aiming to assist an accord on the earliest possible mutual reduction of them, considers that it is possible to reach a corresponding agreement separately, without tying it directly to the problem of space and strategic weapons.

Second, the Soviet Union has introduced a moratorium on the deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe. Third, our country has decided to reduce the number of missiles in a state of operational readiness, in order to bring their overall number to the level existing before the beginning of the adoption of countermeasures. In 2 months, as was announced, the fixed installations for additionally deployed missiles were dismantled. We now have 243 missiles.

These facts convincingly confirm that the Soviet Union does not simply declare its will to achieve an accord, but bears out its readiness to go its part of the distance with real deeds. And under these conditions, the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe looks provocative. Todenhoefer attempts to disguise that fact, too. But it is impossible to justify the course of the United States and the FRG toward an intensification of tension.

More by Aksyonov

LD092308 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1457 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, 9 Jan (TASS) — TASS commentator Lev Aksyonov writes:

The first of 96 U.S. cruise missiles which are to be sited [razmeshcheny] on West German soil in accordance with the NATO "two-track decision" of December 1979, has been delivered to FRG territory. Reporting this, the ARD television company pointed out that this first-strike weapon will be installed at the U.S. military base at Hahn.

Statements by certain West German officials in this connection stress, not without an element of satisfaction, that the NATO schedule for the siting of the new missiles is being carried out with "scrupulous accuracy."

But if those who blindly follow the policy of the Washington administration can feel a certain satisfaction, the same can certainly not be said of the millions of ordinary West Germans who hold a diametrically opposed position on the "missile problems." On the very day that the "winged death" was delivered to the FRG, in the town of Hasselbach, near which the base of Hahn is situated, a mass protest demonstration took place against the escalation of the nuclear missile arms race.

Right-wing political and public figures in the FRG are pointing out with disquiet that considerable damage has been done to the security of West Germany, on whose territory 108 Pershing-2 missiles are already in place.

Even if one does not attempt predict the lethal consequences of the implementation of the "missile decisions" of NATO for the FRG in the "event of armed confrontation", the presence of these weapons in peacetime creates a real threat to the very lives of the citizens of this state. Thus, since the start of the siting [razmeshcheny] of Pershing-2 missiles in the country, several accidents with these missiles have already been recorded, which only thanks to chance did not result in disaster. Now, however, with the appearance of cruise missiles this threat is sharply intensified.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1227

INTERMEDIATE-RANGE NUCLEAR FORCES

BRIEFS

TASS ON UK FIRST PHASE--London, 13 Jan (TASS)--The first phase of the program for the siting [of] U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in Britain has been completed. The program is implemented by the Margaret Thatcher government on Washington's insistence. According to the DAILY EXPRESS, all of the 96 cruise missiles to be deployed at the air force base in Greenham Common have been delivered there and stationed in hardened underground shelters. Now, according to the paper, authorities will center their attention on another base situated at Molesworth. In keeping with the existing plans, another batch of cruise missiles is to be delivered to there next year. According to the DAILY EXPRESS, preparatory work is already under way there. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1751 GMT 13 Jan 86 LD] /9274

MOSCOW CITES DAILY EXPRESS--As pointed out by reports from London, the first stage of deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Great Britain has been completed. All 96 cruise missiles which it was planned to site at the Greenham Common Air Base have been delivered there. Now, as the DAILY EXPRESS paper points out, the attention of the military has now been switched to another air base in Molesworth, to which yet another batch of the same class of nuclear missiles is to be supplied from over the ocean next year. These militaristic plans continue to arouse mass protests from the British public. It is reported that recently British peace supporters have staged new demonstrations at various military installations. Countrywide preparations are in hand for a mighty antinuclear demonstration. [Text] [From "The World Today" program presented by Eduard Mnatsakanov] [Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 14 Jan 86 LD] /9274

SOVIET-DANISH TALKS HELD--Copenhagen, 15 Jan (TASS)--Soviet-Danish working consultations on certain aspects of problems connected with disarmament, in particular concerning the reduction of armed forces and conventional weapons, took place in Copenhagen on 14-15 January. Taking part in the consultation on the Soviet side were Ambassador V. V. Mikhaylov, head of the USSR delegation at the Vienna talks; and L. I. Mendelevich, USSR ambassador to Denmark; and on the Danish side, P. Groot, chief of the department of disarmament at the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and other officials. Participants in the consultations were received by P. (Djuvig), chief of the Foreign Policy Department of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1728 GMT 15 Jan 86 LD] /9274

TASS ON FRG LETTER TO U.S.--Bonn, 13 Jan (TASS)--Torsten Lange, a West German Bundestag deputy from the Greens Party, has denounced U.S. aggressive policy directed at gaining military superiority. In an open letter to the U.S. ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, he criticized the American administration for escalating military preparations on West German territory, assessing these actions as an integral part of the U.S. efforts to establish American domination all over the world, as an attempt to create conditions for waging wars outside U.S. territory. With this aim in mind, the Pentagon has stuffed up West Germany with numerous weaponry systems, which threatens to turn its territory into a radio active desert, the parliamentarian stressed. He pointed to the dangers of the deployment of American first-strike nuclear missiles in West Germany. An overwhelming majority of the country's population are opposed to the deployment. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 0353 GMT 14 Jan 86 LD] /9274

TASS NOTES GERMAN STATEMENT--Bonn, 17 Dec (TASS)--The Council of Minden-Luebecke Community (North Rhine-Westphalia) demanded that the FRG Government should not deploy nuclear and other mass destruction weapons in the territory of the community and not to transport them on its roads. The statement adopted by a majority vote of deputies from the SPD and the Greens Parties also urges the teachers of the district and other persons employed in bringing up the rising generation to devote their activities to fostering in young people the desire to fight for peace. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1726 GMT 17 Dec 85 LD] /9274

CSO: 5200/1227

CHEMICAL/BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

TASS: CHEMICAL WEAPONS DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE RESUMES WORK

Session Opens

LD131717 Moscow TASS in English 1653 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 13 TASS -- The special committee on chemical weapons resumed its work in the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament here today. The urgency of the solution of the problems of prohibiting chemical weapons is recognised by broad sections of the international public. Of principle importance is the fact that at the recent meeting between General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and President of the United States Ronald Reagan in Geneva it has been stressed that both countries are in favour of a general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons and the destruction of the existing stockpiles of such weapons.

The session of the special committee chaired by Stanislaw Turbanski of the Polish People's Republic will last till early February.

Delays Without 'Justification'

LD132213 Moscow TASS in English 2127 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Geneva, January 13 TASS -- The special NGO [nongovernmental organization] committee on disarmament, which resumed its work at the Palace of Nations here today, is considering questions of banning chemical weapons.

The task of eliminating this barbaric means of mass annihilation, including extremely dangerous binary chemical weapons, has become particularly acute. Talks on banning them, however, are being delayed without any justification whatsoever. The Soviet Union, jointly with other fraternal socialist countries, is consistently striving to accelerate the elaboration of an international convention based on the reciprocal manifestation of realism and good will on the part of all participants in the multilateral talks. Representatives of the socialist countries drew attention of their partners in the talks to the corresponding provisions of the Sofia (1985) statement by the Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

Many speakers, addressing the special committee's session, stressed the principled significance of the joint declaration in favour of introducing a comprehensive ban on chemical weapons made by the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States at the summit in November 1985, complemented with a concrete accord to step up the efforts aimed at concluding an effective international convention to this effect.

The head of the Soviet delegation, Viktor Israelyan, stressed, that "it is necessary to implement in practical negotiations this positive potential of progress in destroying chemical weapons. It is justifiable to advance the objective of making the year 1986 a turning period in the multilateral talks on elaborating a convention on the prohibition and elimination of this weapon of mass annihilation."

/9274
CSO: 5200/1225

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

PRAVDA: DECISIONS REQUIRED FOR PROGRESS AT CDE SESSION

PM111425 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent M. Kostikov report: "Stockholm: Decision Time"]

[Text] January -- The next session of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe will begin work in the Swedish captial at the end of January. As is known, representatives of 33 European states plus the United States and Canada -- that is, all the countries which signed the Final Act of the all-European conference in Helsinki -- are taking part in the Stockholm forum.

The present state of affairs at the conference gives grounds for speaking of some progress -- albeit slow -- toward the set goal: the elaboration of mutually acceptable accords on measures designed to promote the strengthening of confidence and security in Europe and the cause of disarmament.

The Soviet-French and Soviet-U.S. summit meetings in Paris and Geneva had an important positive influence on the course of the Stockholm dialogue. I have heard this repeatedly during conversations here with members of various delegations taking part in the conference. This is the view, in particular, of Ambassador R. Barry, the new head of the U.S. delegation, (K. Tsitron), leader of the FRG delegation, and representatives of groups of neutral and nonaligned countries.

As is known, in Geneva the sides agreed to work together with the other states taking part in the Stockholm conference to promote its speedy completion with the adoption of a document which "...would include both mutually acceptable confidence- and security-building measures and an attempt to give concrete form and effectiveness to the principle of the nonuse of force." The accord on preventing any war -- nuclear or conventional -- is also directly relevant to the Stockholm forum. This position agreed on by both the USSR and the United States gave an important impetus to work in Stockholm on the whole range of problems facing the forum: ensuring confidence and security in Europe and returning the continent to the path of detente, a path laid by the all-European conference in Helsinki. These are the goals served by the socialist countries' proposal which provides for concrete commitments on the nonuse of force as well as confidence-building measures in the military sphere. In the assessment of many observers, this proposal has become fundamental in defining the general direction of the conference's work.

Among the vast majority of participants in the Stockholm conference, the conviction has become markedly firmer that European security, like international security in general, cannot be ensured by military means or by military force.

Under present conditions confidence measures in the military sphere will only be effective when they are combined with political steps to strengthen confidence and security. Despite not uncommon open opposition from the United States and a number of its NATO allies, this premise met with broad understanding among the conference participants.

I have repeatedly heard participants in the conference say that real preconditions exist in Stockholm not simply to reaffirm, but to give concrete form to the principle of the nonuse of force and to make it an essential norm in states' behavior. First and foremost, it is a question of the socialist countries' well-known proposal on the conclusion of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and on maintaining relations of peace, of which the pivotal tenet would be an accord on renouncing the use of force in its most dangerous form: the use of all types of arms, whether nuclear or conventional, and consequently, of military force in general. This diplomatic initiative from the socialist community countries met with a wide response in Stockholm. According to Ambassador (V. Leybl), head of the Austrian delegation, "the nonuse of force is indisputably the theme of the conference today." In the course of its discussion the representatives of Cyprus, Sweden, Finland, Italy, Denmark, and other countries have put forward a number of amendments concerning ways and forms of increasing the effectiveness of this very important international commitment. In particular, the proposal was made that the ban should extend to the use of force in any shape, direct or indirect, or any form, be it the use of force or the threat of force, military, political, or economic.

Note was also taken here of a statement by FRG Foreign Minister Genscher, who said in the Bundestag recently: "We demand that no weapons be used -- of either the nuclear or the conventional type. Only an all-embracing renunciation of the use of force can preserve peace."

At the same time, it is striking that the U.S. delegation still seeks to reduce everything to a simple reiteration of what has already been said on the question of the nonuse of force in the UN Charter and the Helsinki Final Act. And certain U.S. allies try either to ignore this important principle or to call it into question as a confidence-building measure. At the same time, in setting up working parties at the conference, the participants agreed on the parallel consideration of political and military aspects of European security. This same principle formed the basis of the accord reached in mid-October 1985 on going over at the conference to concrete talks on a range of questions which could make up the outlines of a future agreement. Against this background the actions of the delegations of the United States and certain other NATO countries look at best like veiled attempts to play a double game and to some degree retard the work of the conference as it enters the homestretch.

The task of ensuring confidence and strengthening security in Europe is also met by the socialist countries' proposals on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe and on giving notification of such exercises and of major troop movements and troop shipments. Their topicality is evident against the background of the scale of NATO's military maneuvers, which are constantly increasing both in terms of the number of troops involved and in the extent of territories covered. This creates a situation where it is basically difficult to distinguish military exercises from the deployment of troops for the commencement of hostilities. This entails an increase in tension, suspicion, and distrust in interstate relations and creates a threat to the European peoples' security.

As past sessions of the conference have shown, the position of the delegations of the United States and other NATO countries still leaves out the discussion of measures

concerning an accord on air and naval strike forces equipped with the most sophisticated weapons of mass destruction and only amounts to measures concerning the activity of ground forces.

At the same time, the Natoites have not given up trying to substitute for effective confidence-building measures their antithesis: measures aimed at uncovering the deployment and structure of the European states' armed forces and obtaining unilateral advantages. Such actions cannot fail to arouse quite natural suspicions on the other side and thus, in no way accord with the main task of the conference.

People here hope that 1986, which has been declared International Peace Year, must be for the Stockholm forum a year of important decisions in favor of peace, confidence, and security in Europe and the return of interstate relations to the policy of detente.

Thanks to the constructive efforts of a number of states, the outlines are emerging, so to speak, of possible accords at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. All the participants will have to roll up their sleeves and get down to work so that positive results are achieved in Stockholm before the start of the next all-European meeting. This, as is known, is planned for next fall. So it is decision time.

/9274
CSO: 5200/1224

EUROPEAN CONFERENCES

BRIEFS

SOVIET-FRENCH CDE CONSULTATIONS--Soviet-French consultations on the subject of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe and also on questions connected with the ban.ing of chemical weapons were held at the USSR Foreign Ministry 6-8 January. Participating in them on the French side were (P. Eno), chief of a French External Relations Ministry department, and (P. Gashinyar), head of the French delegation at the Foreign Ministry Collegium, and O. A. Grinevskiy, special envoy. The representatives of the French External Relations Ministry were received by A. G. Kovalev, USSR deputy foreign minister. J. B. Raimond, French ambassador to the USSR, was present at the talks. [Text] [TASS report: "Soviet-French Consultations"] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4 PM] /9274

CSO: 5200/1224

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

GORBACHEV REPLIES TO ADDRESS BY LONDON COUNCIL HEAD

LD020839 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0750 GMT 2 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 2 TASS -- The full text of the reply of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to an address from Kenneth Livingstone follows:

"Dear Mr. Livingstone,

I read with close attention your address, pervaded with awareness of the need to take urgent measures to rid the peoples of the nuclear threat. The worry of your compatriots about the dangerous development of the world situation is fully shared in the Soviet Union.

Mankind is living through a critical period in its history. It has no choice but to survive or to destroy itself entirely. So today, it is more incumbent than ever before upon all the politicians to whom people have entrusted responsibility for their future to display a broad statesman-like approach and the ability to rise above narrow, selfish interests and to realize in full, the collective and individual responsibility of states for the destinies of peace.

Pursuing a clear and consistently peace-loving course the Soviet Union is doing all that it can to close the path into space to arms and to achieve radical reduction in nuclear weapons and, in the final analysis, their complete elimination. The Soviet Union is undertaking positive steps in this direction, the need for which you mention in your address. The USSR already has pledged not to be first to use nuclear weapons and has introduced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The prospects for transforming this moratorium into a mutual accord depend on the U.S. Government.

We favor an immediate freeze on nuclear weapons and a complete ban without an expiry date on testing them and with the most effective verification. We are ready in the very near future again to engage in tripartite talks in order to find a mutually acceptable solution to this problem, together with representatives of the United States and Great Britain.

You also know that our country has proposed a 50 percent reduction of the corresponding nuclear weapons of the USSR and United States. Of course, progress at the Geneva talks is possible only if there is a full ban on offensive space weapons -- in other words, the abandonment of the "star wars" program, the realization of which would result in strategic chaos and a qualitatively new, uncontrollable phase of the arms race. Unfortunately we see that the fatal consequences of joining in the "star wars" plans are still not realized fully by the ruling circles of either Great Britain or certain other of the United States' closest allies.

I warmly remember my visit to your country a year ago and the numerous meetings on British soil. I understand the striving of the British to preserve their traditions and their historical heritage, to augment achievements in various fields and pass all this on to their descendants intact.

People in other European countries, in the Soviet Union, and the whole world, are showing similar concern. This is why the peoples' concern is quite legitimate in connection with the fact that ever-increasing mountains of death-dealing weapons are appearing on the path to realizing these noble humane tasks. Even the relatively small British Isles are now filling up with nuclear weapons, the presence of which, it should be said outright, does not strengthen anyone's security.

An important place in the struggle to limit the area of nuclear preparations is occupied by nulcear weapons nonproliferation measures and measures to create non-nuclear zones in various parts of the world. The proclamation of specific areas and towns as nuclear-weapons-free zones, also goes in this direction. In this we perceive the peoples' realization of their responsibility for the world's fate and their intention to act in forms available to them. The edifice of peace is made of separate bricks. Detente is made up of tiny grains.

It is pleasing to see that the movement of local authorities and other organizations in support of setting up nuclear-free zones is growing and becoming stronger. In our view such zones are not wishful thinking or idealistic dreams, but a positive phenomenon in international life reflecting the will of ordinary people for peace, cooperation and detente.

In our attitude to nuclear-free zones we do not make exceptions for any states, be they participants or nonparticipants in military alliances. We have one condition: If any country refuses to acquire nuclear weapons and does not have them on its territory then it receives from us firm and effective guarantees. For example, if Great Britain fully rejects nuclear weaponry and eliminates foreign nuclear bases from its territory then the USSR would guarantee that Soviet nuclear weapons would not be targeted on British territory and would not be used against it. Such guarantees could also be formulated by concluding an official agreement that takes into consideration all the appropriate aspects of a military nature.

We value highly the aspiration of the Greater London Council, as well as of many hundreds of municipalities in dozens of countries of the world, who make their contribution to the common efforts of peoples, which are directed toward removing the nuclear threat and of restoring an atmosphere of trust and mutual understanding in relations between states.

I wish you further success in your noble activity in the name of preserving peace on earth. Accept my very best wishes for the coming new year.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev.

Kenneth Livingston, the leader of the Greater London Council, the organ of self-government of the capital of Great Britain, wrote a letter in December 1985 to Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, setting out the views of the British supporters on the creation of zones free of nuclear weapons (the Greater London Council proclaimed London to be a nuclear-free zone on 21 July 1981). The letter outlines the aims of this movement and stresses that "never before has there been a more powerful demand for progress in international talks on disarmament than now." The leader of the Greater London Council expressed his support for all steps directed toward reducing the risk of nuclear war, including those already taken by the Soviet Union.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PRAVDA ASKS U.S. NOT TO 'MISS CHANCE' OF TEST BAN

PM231713 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[N. Prozhogin article: "Unique Chance; Adoption of the Soviet Moratorium Proposal Would Mark a Real Step Along the Road of Ending the Nuclear Arms Race"]

[Text] It is probably easier for human minds to realize what happened in Hiroshima at 0815 hours on 6 August 1945 by moving from the individual to the general. Maybe that is why visitors to the Hiroshima Memorial Museum spend a particularly long time in front of those exhibits which attest to the fate of individuals. Among them are stone steps with a human silhouette imprinted on them--all that is left of one of the hundreds of thousands of instantly incinerated people.

It is common knowledge that there are enough combat nuclear charges accumulated now not only to cause a multitude of Hiroshimas but to destroy our entire planet many times over. And their numbers continue to grow. Moreover, their quality is improving (what inappropriate words in this context!). How can this be stopped?

One possible way prompted by reason and a sense of responsibility for mankind's fate is to end the nuclear explosions and tests during which weapons that harbor the threat of not a mythical but an entirely real apocalypse are further developed and improved.

The Soviet Union made that proposal. Not only in words but in deeds. Striving to promote the ending of the dangerous competition in building up and improving nuclear arsenals and wishing to set an example of good will, our country this year decided to unilaterally end all nuclear explosions and introduce a moratorium on them starting 6 August, the day on which the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima tragedy was marked worldwide.

In introducing this moratorium, the Soviet Union appealed to the U.S. Government to end its own nuclear explosions on the same date. It was announced that our unilateral moratorium would last until 1 January 1986. However, it would continue to operate after that date if the United States also refrained from carrying out nuclear explosions. Obviously, being reciprocal for both the major nuclear powers, the moratorium would be a

good example to other states with corresponding weapons. Favorable conditions would thereby be created for concluding an international treaty on the complete and universal prohibition of nuclear weapons tests, and these weapons themselves, having lost the opportunity for endless improvement, would be doomed to virtual necrosis [omertvleniye].

Here it is appropriate, even briefly, to recall that the Soviet moratorium was by no means the first step taken by the USSR aimed at eliminating nuclear weapons. Back in 1946 it proposed concluding an international convention on banning such weapons. In 1982 the Soviet Union pledged, also unilaterally, not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. If all the nuclear powers made similar pledges, the way would be opened for the conclusion of an international treaty banning the use of these mass destruction weapons. Continuing to actively struggle for the removal of the nuclear threat, the USSR has repeatedly reaffirmed and continues to reaffirm that, given an accord with the other powers, it is prepared to embark on nuclear disarmament at any moment.

The Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva will resume soon. Their goal, according to the joint accord reaffirmed at summit level, is to prevent the start of an arms race in space, to end it on earth, and to switch to radical nuclear arms reductions up to the complete elimination of nuclear arms. The Soviet proposals aimed at achieving these goals--including the proposal for a 50-percent cut in strategic nuclear arms given the nonmilitarization of space--are on the table at the Geneva talks.

The problem of ending nuclear explosions is not a new one either. Several years ago it was examined in detail at trilateral talks between the USSR, the United States, and Britain. Once it even seemed that the sides had come close to a mutual understanding and that agreement among them was possible. But then the United States took its "unilateral step"--it wrecked the talks. And it still refuses to resume them.

There are many facts demonstrating that the Soviet initiative meets the aspirations of the world's peoples. There is the appeal in this vein by a group of prominent Nobel Prize winning scientists to the USSR and U.S. leaders. There is the appeal to them by the leaders of six states on different continents--Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden. Finally, there is also the appeal adopted recently by the UN General Assembly for an immediate nuclear weapons test ban.

However, Washington's reaction to Moscow's proposal to make the moratorium on nuclear explosions reciprocal has been ostentatiously negative. At a time when the world, which has perceived the Soviet initiative with satisfaction, was awaiting similar concrete steps from the U.S. side, the United States continued its nuclear explosions, disregarding the international public's opinion with imperial disdain.

U.S. nuclear tests are continuing to this day. More and more new and increasingly dangerous aspects of these experiments are coming to light.

They include the development of lasers triggered by nuclear explosions. The Pentagon is counting on using the relevant devices in the development [razrabotka] of its "star wars" plans.

Such experiments must once and for all dispel the smokescreen behind which Washington has tried to conceal the true reasons for its reluctance to follow the Soviet Union's example. Striving to build up and improve its nuclear arsenal, the United States has cited both the lack of the appropriate monitoring system and again an imaginary lag behind the USSR in the nuclear research sphere. However, all these pseudoarguments have already been refuted.

By ascertaining the precise data of the latest U.S. nuclear explosion, the USSR clearly showed that existing national facilities are sufficient to carry out the monitoring. Nevertheless, having a direct interest in increasing the effectiveness of that monitoring, the Soviet Union also supports the idea of an international verification system. For this it is possible to use, for example, the proposal of the above-mentioned six states regarding the creation of special stations on their territories to monitor the observance of an accord on the ending of tests. In another show of goodwill, the USSR is ready to go even further. It agrees to negotiate with the United States on certain local-level control measures. Those people who laid stress on that should give thought to how their negative reaction will seem now in the world public's eyes.

As for the U.S. "lag," it is worth recalling that the United States has carried out far more nuclear tests than the Soviet Union. But it is not a question of arithmetic here. Taking the decision to impose a unilateral moratorium, the USSR was guided by political categories and the desire to help end the nuclear arms race.

It is enshrined in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement on the Geneva summit results that "the sides, mindful of the special responsibility of the USSR and United States in the matter of preserving peace, state that nuclear war must never be launched and that there can be no winner in it." These are wise words. But is it not time for the U.S. side to switch from words to deeds and halt the preparation for nuclear war?

The U.S. refusal to join with the Soviet Union in ending nuclear explosions means that our country's commitment to a unilateral moratorium will lapse after 1 January 1986. It must be clear to everyone that in the face of the U.S. military preparations the USSR cannot sacrifice the interests of its security on the security of its allies and friends.

"At the moment there is still a unique chance to make the moratorium reciprocal and extend it after 1 January 1986," M.S. Gorbachev said recently. "To miss that chance, paving the way to the definitive banning by treaty of all nuclear weapons tests, would be at the very least foolish. The resolution of the question is in the U.S. Administration's hands."

...On the memorial to the victims of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima is inscribed: "Sleep peacefully. This will never happen again." Approaching the new year of 1986, the peoples of the world want to live in peace. They want to be able to hope that neither they, nor their children, nor their grandchildren will ever be threatened by a universal Hiroshima. Reason suggests that the unique chance offered by the Soviet Union's courageous unilateral step must not be missed.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA DECRIES U.S. STAND ON TEST BAN TREATY

PM201654 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Valentin Falin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Test of Policy. Will Nuclear Explosions Be Ended?"]

[Text] The 40th UN General Assembly (UNGA) session approved a resolution in favor of the immediate ending and banning of nuclear weapon tests. This "resolute appeal" to all states, and primarily the nuclear states, reflects the world community's concern at "the intensification of the nuclear arms race and the growth of the threat of nuclear war." The conclusion of a multilateral nuclear test ban treaty, the resolution stresses, would be "an integral factor for the success of efforts aimed at ending and reversing the arms race and the race to qualitatively improve nuclear weapons and at preventing the expansion of existing arsenals of nuclear weapons and the proliferation of nuclear weapons to further countries." Welcoming the Soviet Union's 6 August 1985 suspension of nuclear tests, the UN members expressed the hope that the other nuclear powers will join this moratorium.

As yet the hope has not been fated to be realized. Three imperialist "democracies" -- the United States, Britain, and France -- have set themselves against the opinion and will of the overwhelming majority.

The paramount consideration for Paris is its "independent deterrent potential," which is identified with the possession of weapons which single the French out from the common herd. London overtly backs up its overseas partner in its thankless attempts to disrupt international efforts to strengthen universal security.

From one session to the next the United States opposes UN decisions on practially all problems relating to disarmament and the defense of the people against militarism and the fascist and neocolonialist threats and on questions of eliminating national, racial, and economic discrimination, reacting with hostility even to things to which it has only recently professed to swear allegiance. What has happened? The U.S. rulers have again been seized by an obsession which a great poet expressed in the lines: Only love my name, and me also, for I am your "desire." Has the country gotten stuck in a policy of strength? Is there no way people there will find within themselves the ability to align military strategy with a positive political objective?

Some Americans have described the termination of nuclear tests as the most logical initial step toward curbing the arms race. Probably that is indeed the case. Therefore the government's attitude toward the problem of tests is highly illuminating -- you can follow the string back to its source.

The United States has carried out another five nuclear explosions since the Soviet Union introduced the moratorium. Since 1945 the Americans have tested 30 percent more nuclear devices than the USSR -- approximately 50 percent more if you take into account British explosions, some of which have been carried out at U.S. test sites. If and when Washington argues about a "lag," it is in fact talking about what somebody else is suffering.

References to the "unreliability" of national means of verification are equally far-fetched. Modern instruments make it possible to detect tests of less than a 0.5 kiloton yield from a distance of 4,000-5,000 km. In principle no supranational means of detection are needed, especially by the Americans, who have surrounded the Soviet Union with electronic listening stations. However we have no less interest than Washington in reliable verification, and the Soviet Union provides for adequate [adekvatnyy] international inspection, but only to ensure the observance of accords on ending tests, not their continuation. No, verfication is manifestly not the point, as is eloquently recorded in an Arms Control and Disarmament Agency document. "An exhaustive solution" to the verification problem, we read in it, is not enough to start talks on a complete nuclear test ban.

Thus, in addition to the routine arguments repeated with the regularity of the Lord's prayer there are also less well-used formulations. They are uttered reluctantly, through clenched teeth, since they gel extremely badly with officially declared U.S. policy. Washington gives assurances that it is firmly opposed to the proliferation of nuclear weapons, considers nuclear war futile, and intends to strive for the eliminations of nuclear weapons. No matter how pleasant to the ear declarations of this kind may be, they do not add to security. Rather security suffers when honeyed words are used to divert attention from matters which are as bitter as wormwood.

Miracles of various kinds happen in politics. Black sometimes becomes white. Nevertheless there are some things in politics which are incompatible. If all nuclear weapons are to be eliminated in the foreseeable future it is indeed senseless to create more and more new types and varieties of such weapons. If it is impossible to win a nuclear war and the task of coming out on top is not set, why build up additional mountains of nuclear arms?

If the intention is to strengthen and encourage nonproliferation as a first step along the path to a nuclear-free world, it is high time that the nuclear powers themselves came to their senses and stopped moving nuclear weapons into new foreign territories and new waters. Or else.

There is no point running away from the truth and pretending that it is unclear what point the U.S. leaders see in "creating a new generation of nuclear arms," designing an "x-ray laser" with the cumulative energy of an atomic explosion, or carrying out tests to allegedly hone the methods for detecting "secret violations." In today's terms the atomic shells which incinerated Hiroshima and Nagasaki were primitive. But has the world found tranquility because people have learned how to split the atom with an effectiveness which was not even dreamed of 40 years ago, because the number of shells now runs into tens of thousands rather than just units? So many nuclear weapons have been accumulated that there are enough to destroy all the planets of the solar system put together. Does this gloomy fact testify to the power of the human spirit and the wisdom of terrestrial politicians. That is extremely doubtful.

Let us suppose that they create the next generation of nuclear weapons, the third one. Are they likely to be satisfied with that? Why should the same idea not occur to the

next president, who would also be possessed by the desire to leave his mark in the nuclear sphere? Following precedent, he would mobilize scientists, engineers, and budget funds and -- if you please -- he would unswaddle before your very eyes yet another "baby," since the atom has no end.

It is simpler to begin than to halt, if state actions are motivated by inner springs instead of external circumstances. To halt even under conditions which can be described as favoring the solution of the problem, with only 5 nuclear powers involved instead of 15 or 20. Let us remark that the privilege to remain nuclear has not been unconditionally granted to the five by the international community. The nonnuclear states have not given the nuclear states their approval to develop, on the basis of their possession of this inhuman weapons, doctrines which threaten the existence of the whole of mankind.

This is why the argument that the United States needs the tests in order to maintain "reliable stockpiles" of weapons cannot produce a favorable response. Even less so in view of the fact that closer examination reveals how insatiable U.S. appetites are when defining the term "reliability." It appears that "reliability" is somehow related to demands for superiority or at least advantage. Quantitatively, the United States lays claims to arsenals of the order of 50-60,000 nuclear charges. Qualitatively, it wants to attach to every new missile, aircraft, or torpedo something supernatural and unprecedented. The absence of super-new charges would thwart the incentive and even the opportunity for the development [razrabotka] of super-new delivery vehicles and of supermodern doctrines for the waging of war. The arms race as a whole would start to run out of steam.

This scenario is present in the statement by the not unknown R. Perle, who explained a few days ago to members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "I do not believe in a total ban on testing at a time when the United States is dependent on reliable nuclear weapons." In other words, for as long as U.S. strategy is based on the use of nuclear weapons -- and indeed on first use -- all links in the chain must be firmly welded together. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, Perle's assessment in this instance was not -- exceptionally -- totally extreme. He has been overtaken by the arms control agency's K. Adelman.

In its reports to the U.S. House of Representatives Foreign Relations Committee, the agency has made the termination of tests conditional upon preliminary agreement on a "substantial reduction" of the level of nuclear arms, the retention of "an impressive nuclear deterrent potential" (by the U.S. side), "improved verification opportunities," and the "expansion of confidence-building measures." "Before we give up our nuclear deterrent potential, and consequently nuclear tests," the agency recommends, "it is necessary to resolve the question of USSR superiority in nonnuclear forces." Do they seem to have omitted something? No, "human rights" and changes in the Soviet Union's social structure have not been omitted -- they come under the heading of "confidence-building measures." Not a mention, as usual, of U.S. superiority in the categories of military bases and naval forces, or the U.S. allies' potential. But none of this is taken into account. It seems to be standing in isolation.

Explaining the essence of things to congressmen, Pentagon consultant Dr L. Sykes noted that the "main obstacles" preventing the administration from agreeing to stop tests "are not scientific or technical; they stem from the concept that U.S. interests would be best served by further tests and the development [razrabotka] of new nuclear weapon systems." The evil resides in this aggressive concept, in Washington's hegemonist political course, in its attempts to make the surrounding world accept its directives, for which it needs an endless amount of weapons.

The main reason encouraging R. Reagan to uphold a position on nuclear tests which is extremely unpopular in the world, the conservative weekly U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT wrote, is the desire to open wide the door to nuclear energy within the "strategic defense initiative" (SDI) framework. The President and his entourage are hardly concerned by the fact, the journal notes, that the United States is in conflict not with one but with three current arms control treaties. A few days ago the organization in charge of SDI implementation requested the appropriation of another $100 million (in addition to $282 million) for scientific research whose purpose is to accelerate the underground testing of nuclear weapons intended to be deployed in space. The midwives are still hovering around the "star wars" program, but it is already pockmarking the planet and is also whipping up the nuclear arms race.

The Soviet moratorium remains in effect until new year. The U.S. leadership still has time to ponder the weighty meaning of what it heard at the recent Geneva summit meeting. It can still respond constructively to the 24 October joint message from the heads of state and government of six countries who called on the United States and the Soviet Union to halt all nuclear tests for a 12-month period. It still has a chance to revise its negative attitude toward the UNGA resolution. In 10 days' time the peoples will learn the real worth of R. Reagan's words, because it is up to him whether next year will be better than this year as regards the decisive question for mankind -- the question of ending the arms race. Such a short period -- 10 days -- and so much depends on it.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA CITES U.S. OPINION ON NUCLEAR TEST BAN

PM241601 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Soldatov report: "Contrary to Common Sense: Washington Is Ignoring Calls for the Establishment of a Moratorium on Nuclear Explosions"]

[Text] New York--The U.S. Republican administration reacted negatively to the repeated Soviet proposal to join in the moratorium on nuclear explosions under conditions of an international system of verification. At first officials refused to comment on the subject.

Eventually, as already reported in IZVESTIYA, White House spokesman L. Speakes stated at a briefing for journalists that the United States refuses to join in the moratorium on nuclear explosions which the Soviet Union declared unilaterally at the beginning of August this year. According to Speakes, tests of American nuclear weapons are necessary so that these weapons "remain reliable." Moreover, in his words, the administration "does not trust" the Soviet Union and therefore cannot be sure that it will observe the moratorium.

The administration's nervous reaction to the Soviet proposal is easy to understand. It is only a month since the Soviet-American summit meeting. The participants, as is known, stated that they will seek to prevent an arms race in space and end it on earth. Is the United States ready to take the first step in this direction? This possibility is opened up by Washington's joining the moratorium on nuclear tests announced by the Soviet Union.

Many Americans have come out in favor of a moratorium. The well known American physicist and Nobel prize winner Glenn Seaborg, who for 10 years headed the Nuclear Energy Commission in Washington, considers it necessary for the United States to join in the moratorium. An agreement on ending nuclear explosions, he stated not long ago in an interview, will delay the further improvement of nuclear arsenals and make it more difficult to create new weapon systems which could have a destabilizing effect on the existing balance of forces in the world.

A moratorium on nuclear explosions, in Seaborg's opinion, will make it possible in the space of a few months to conclude a long-term agreement whose observance could be monitored with the help of other states. Such an agreement would be evidence that the countries possessing the greatest nuclear potential intend seriously to set about reducing the arms race.

Other prominent American scientists are of the same opinion. In public statements and interviews they speak of the need to ban nuclear explosions. American scientists, among other things, reject assertions that the United States cannot agree to a moratorium because the Soviet Union has supposedly carried out more nuclear explosions. According to scientists' calculations, from 1945 to the end of 1984 the United States tested 772 nuclear devices, while the Soviet Union, which created nuclear weapons in the late forties, tested 556 devices.

Many ordinary Americans also advocate a ban on nuclear tests. Under pressure from the public, some months ago the Illinois state house of representatives adopted a resolution calling on President R. Reagan and the American Congress "to declare a moratorium on tests of nuclear warheads and missiles" for the period of talks with the Soviet Union. On the eve of the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva, more than a million signatures were collected in the United States in a short space of time, on a demand for an end to nuclear explosions.

World public opinion also demands a total ban on such explosions. For several years in succession the UN General Assembly has called for a ban on nuclear weapon tests. Such a resolution was also approved at the jubilee 40th session.

The conclusion of a treaty on halting and banning nuclear weapon tests is facilitated by the fact that reliable means of verification of its observance exist at the present time. The Soviet Union, which is unable to rely on the conscientiousness of the U.S. side but is interested in the effectiveness of such a treaty, is prepared to also examine the possibility of the establishment of international monitoring. The Soviet Union is prepared to come to an agreement with the United States on certain measures of on-site monitoring.

It would seem that everything--the international commitments of the United States, world public opinion, the mood of the majority of Americans, and the possibilities of monitoring--speaks in favor of the United States joining the moratorium declared by the Soviet Union long ago. But Washington is stubbornly saying "No." Why?

Speaking at a hearing of a House of Representatives committee, Professor R. Sykes, a Pentagon consultant, stated frankly that the Reagan administration opposes the halting of nuclear tests not because it is guided by some kind of scientific or technical considerations. "The main

obstacle is the administration's firm conviction that U.S. security is best served by the continuation of the tests and the development [sozdaniye] of new types of nuclear weapons."

"U.S. security" is a convenient cliche which is frequently used to cover up the aggressive plans of the U.S. ruling elite. In this case it would be more correct to speak of the administration's desire to gain superiority over the Soviet Union by means of the development [sozdaniye] of new types of nuclear weapons and by considerably increasing its nuclear potential. It is no accident that under the present administration, the United States carried out annually almost 50 percent more underground nuclear explosions than under the previous administration. Many of them are not reported.

Washington's immediate plans include testing a nuclear device for a laser which constitutes one of the main components of the system for waging "star wars," described by President R. Reagan as "nonnuclear."

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR AWAITS U.S. RESPONSE IN JOINING MORATORIUM

'No Right to Ignore It'

LD200551 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Kim Gerasimov commentary]

[Excerpts] The foreign press comments that the consistent, peace-loving course of the Soviet Union was again graphically confirmed during the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and the American co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Lown.

Thus, once again the Soviet Union addresses the United States with words of good will. Its address, as we have just heard, is meeting positive responses in the most varied countries, among people of the most varied political convictions, for it is a question of removing one of the most fundamental obstacles on the path of curtailing the fatal arms race of averting the danger of a nuclear war. This is precisely the significance of halting nuclear tests. After all, to put an end to them means first, to stop the endless perfecting of nuclear weapons; and second, to bring about the actual liquidation of their arsenals, since it is necessary constantly and selectively to check the accumulated arsenals of such weapons as to whether they are suitable for use.

Of course, the perfecting of nuclear weapons by one side forces the other side to do the same. The result is a vicious circle. And, wishing to break that very vicious circle the Soviet Union made a bold and decisive step. It announced a unilateral moratorium, beginning 6 August of this year, on any kind of nuclear explosions lasting until 1 January of the coming year. Our country stated that it was prepared to lengthen this moratorium for any period even after 1 January if the American side would follow our example.

How the American side answered is well known. It answered with a series of underground nuclear explosions. In fact, a routine test has been planned for this very day, and is being held within the framework of the Star Wars program. By the way, this once again reminds one of the threat to the world and international security which is posed by this would-be peaceful venture, supposedly called upon to put an end to nuclear weapons on earth.

The real path toward averting the nuclear threat, a nuclear catastrophe, is not by way of testing newer and newer death-bearing forms of weapons, but by way of decisive steps for reducing such weapons on earth and the prevention of their extension into space. And of extreme importance here is the cessation of their testing.

The unilateral Soviet moratorium for nuclear explosions hands to the United States, if they are really so anxious for the well-being of humanity as is said, a marvelous opportunity to demonstrate this in practice. The unilateral Soviet moratorium may and should become a joint Soviet-American moratorium. This is the demand of the overwhelming majority of humanity. This is the intent of the new call by the Soviet Union.

The United States has no right to ignore it.

Moratorium Keeps With Geneva Spirit

LD200331 Moscow in English in North America 2300 GMT 19 Dec 85

[Vladislav Kozyakov commentary]

[Text] Needless to say that the American people are no less interested in stopping nuclear testing than are the Soviet people or any other nation. To ban all nuclear weapons tests would mean to make a decisive step toward curbing the arms race and consolidating peace. It is impossible to develop new types of nuclear armaments without testing. If the first test ban treaty of 1963 prohibited underground explosions there would have been no such weapons as multiple warheads, neutron projectiles, nuclear cruise missiles, and some others. What is true of the past is equally true of the future. In other words, such a simple step as a joint Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear explosions would serve the purpose of halting the continued increase of nuclear stockpiles and averting the war danger.

That is why the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions beginning 6 August this year, and invited the United States to join the effort. As the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev said, when we took the step we sincerely wanted to break the vicious circle, stop the endless modernization of nuclear arms, and actually freeze the arsenals. I spoke of this to President Reagan in Geneva, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out while talking to Prof Bernard Lown, the American co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, on Wednesday. The Soviet leader continued: We are very sorry that the United States has not followed the Soviet example yet.

Well, it is our firm belief that the continued underground tests in Nevada are closely connected with the plans of achieving military superiority, especially in strike space weapons. It is noteworthy what THE WASHINGTON POST reported on this score the other day. The SDI

organization demands $100 million more to speed up underground nuclear tests of weapons based in space, the report said. Will you compare this with understandings reached in Geneva. The Soviet Union and the United States have agreed according to the joint statement not to seek military superiority and to strive for the prevention of the arms race in space and for its end on earth. It goes without saying that it is not continued nuclear tests in Nevada but the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions which corresponds to the spirit of Geneva.

The Soviet moratorium will be in force until the end of this year, but we are ready to extend it if the United States does the same, said Mikhail Gorbachev speaking in the Kremlin on Wednesday. We insistently urge the American administration to do so, he continued. There still is a unique chance of making the moratorium mutual and prolonging it after 1 January. It would be extremely unsensible to lose this chance that paves the way to a final agreed ban on all nuclear arms tests. The solution of the question is in the hands of the United States Government, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

Verification, Control 'No Obstacle'

LD201103 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] The White House and the Defense Department has sharply criticized the Congressional proposal to ban further testing of antisatellite weapons, saying that such a ban would send the wrong signal to Moscow. Here are some details:

Comparing signals travelling from Washington to Moscow and vice versa is a full time occupation for some academics and experts, and the subject for daily or weekly columns by big name journalists, but do they have any real meaning for the rest of us, known as the common folk? What sort of signal did this country send to your leaders when on 6 August this year we unilaterally stopped all nuclear testing. We here thought it was the right signal. Our moratorium up till next 1 January, was a concrete step, move, deed, or initiative, call it what you like, expressing our desire to halt the nuclear arms race. What was the American signal? Nuclear testing, we're told, is vital for the American military program. What is more, it is vital for the star wars program, because some of the subcomponents of SDI, certain types of lasers, require continued perfection of nuclear warheads.

Over 2 years ago this country signalled to Washington that there can be a solution to the problem of antisatellite weapons. The Soviet Union undertook a unilateral moratorium not to launch any antisatellite weapons. However, even an attempt to show reciprocity by the U.S. Congress is branded as the wrong signal to Moscow. Every time we hope we can help arms control by stopping and doing nothing for at least sometime, and call on Washington to join us, the answer is no, because to help arms control the United States has to continue arming. And every time there's

an explanation or justification for not joining us. The absence of adequate verification measures and inspection is one of them. This country is no less interested in effective control and verification than the United States. We have valid reasons not to rely on words alone. In addition to national means of control, this country is in favor of the international system of control and verification. Thus, as was proposed by Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden, special stations to monitor underground explosions be set up on their territories. [sentence as heard] In other words, we could have such monitoring stations around the world.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. To remove possible doubts and suspicions about compliance, that is, in case of a joint Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear testing, this country and the United States could simultaneously agree on some on-site verification measures. In other words, verification and control are not an obstacle to reaching agreement on a joint moratorium. The United States has a unique chance not to waste a precious opportunity and join this country in banning nuclear explosions. We have yet to see what sort of signal will be beamed from Washington to Moscow this time, just a month after the Geneva summit. In the meantime, on Tuesday the United States carried out another underground test, codenamed goldstone.

U.S. Has 'Unique Opportunity'

LD221203 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 21 Dec 85

[Commentary by Aleksandr Druzhinin on Soviet nuclear blast moratorium]

[Excerpts] It is easy to understand the world public concern. The issue of stopping nuclear tests is getting ever more pressing. That is due above all to the realization by people that an end to nuclear tests would mean curbing the arms race and consequently a lessening of the menace of military disaster. One could give other reasons that make pressing the need to do away with nuclear tests. It is impermissible for example that nuclear explosions carried out in a total over 1,000 in the 40 years of existence of nuclear weapons should harm our planet that all of us have to live on as well as the coming generations. But the main thing though is that a halt to nuclear tests would become a real contribution to disarmament and to greater universal security.

Proceeding from this assumption the Soviet Union unilaterally introduced last 6 August a moratorium on all nuclear explosions for both military and peaceful purposes. The unwillingness of the United States to take the step can only be explained by Washington's desire to expand its programs to develop new types of armaments, including space armaments, and nuclear tests are needed to cope with these programs. In the meantime there is still a chance to make the nuclear test moratorium bilateral and in this way to start a process of curbing the arms race. It would be unreasonable to miss the chance to say the least. Will it be possible to use this unique opportunity? The answer to that question depends entirely on the United States administration.

Need for Reciprocity

LD232154 Moscow World Service in English 1650 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Viktor Vasilyev commentary]

[Text] [Passage indistinct] the issue of getting rid of nuclear weapons. This is not surprising because even if only some of the stocks of nuclear weapons were committed to use, it could well spell the end of civilization. This problem [word indistinct] the special responsibility of the nuclear powers, and especially the Soviet Union and the United States. At the Geneva summit in November the two countries agreed that a nuclear war must never be started: no nation could win such a war. This realization is set down in the joint statement issued at the end of the summit. Now (?other) nations have a right to expect practical moves reflecting this general agreement. Earlier talks on easing military tension have shown that the issue of getting rid of nuclear weapons (?could not be settled all at once). There must be movement towards it, to specific agreements that limit and reduce these weapons. One such move in the Soviet Union's opinion would be to stop nuclear testing.

Last summer the Soviet Union suspended all nuclear explosions unilaterally and called on the United States to do the same. This moratorium remains in effect until 1 January next year, but the United States was told at the time that if it announced its own moratorium the Soviet Union would continue to refrain from nuclear tests. Now, why has the Soviet Union urged the United States to stop all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis? The reason is that the repudiation of nuclear tests would stop the improvement of existing weapons and the creation of new ones. The stocks of nuclear weapons would become obsolete.

The Soviet proposal gives neither the Soviet Union nor the United States any advantage: Each has its own program of nuclear tests and each would stop its tests. Militarily this would make it possible to stop the race in nuclear arms and politically it would be a signal to the other nuclear powers and give a strong impetus to settling other major international problems in the spirit of the Geneva summit. It would help to prevent nuclear war and it would promote (?the goals) reaffirmed at the Geneva summit of forestalling an arms race in space, stopping the race on earth and limiting and reducing nuclear weapons.

It is to be regretted that the United States has turned down the Soviet proposal. More than that, it continues to stage underground explosions and makes no secret of the fact that these are intended to develop warheads for the latest intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-based missiles and long-range cruise missiles [word indistinct]. The United States is also using underground explosion into a laser ray that can be used for star wars. But such moves can hardly reduce the threat of war or bring an end to nuclear weapons. To [word indistinct] (?this)

unwillingness to stop nuclear tests, Washington claims the Soviet Union is intransigent about controls. But this is simply not true. In the first place, both countries have the technical facilities to monitor the place and yield of nuclear explosions, in the second place, the Soviet Union is prepared to agree to additional measures that will increase the degree of control. It approved of the proposal made by Argentina, Mexico, Greece, Sweden, India, and Tanzania to set up on their territory special stations to monitor a ban on nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union is also ready to go farther: If the United States also imposes a moratorium on nuclear tests, this country would be prepared to agree to some on-site inspection to clear up any doubts about observance of the bilateral moratorium. So the only real obstacle to an end to nuclear tests is the unwillingness of the United States. Then what must the Soviet Union think? If the United States votes to capitalize on the unilateral Soviet moratorium for it to continue its armed build-up in space weapons, as in other weapons, and gain a military advantage, the Soviet Union is not prepared to sacrifice its own security or that of its allies and friends.

The unilateral moratorium, as I have said, has a deadline. Time is running out. The Soviet Union has certainly shown a responsible and constructive attitude towards stopping nuclear tests. On the 18th of this month, Mikhail Gorbachev told the co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War that the Soviet Union will go as far as is necessary to bring about an end to all nuclear weapons and remove the threat of a nuclear war for all time. It is eager to ensure that most important human right, the right to life. The Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev said, would like to see an immediate nuclear freeze and a total and lasting ban on nuclear tests with most effective controls. The only condition is reciprocity.

Lack of Response Lamented

LD232322 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Viktor Yenikeyev commentary]

[Text] Just days are to go before the new year. They will provide the answer to the question whether or not the United States joins in the moratorium on nuclear explosions the Soviet Union announced on 6 August in a unilateral move. People in Britain and the United States are more used to celebrating Christmas than the new year. However, if the United States joined in the Soviet moratorium people in Britain, the United States, here in the Soviet Union, and elsewhere would have a good reason to celebrate the holiday as a historic event, a milestone on the path toward a safe and peaceful future. Should the United States follow the Soviet example the moratorium would be prolonged and opportunities would open up at the Soviet-American negotiations to reach agreement on ending and banning all nuclear weapon tests.

Regrettably, I have had to put my verbs in the subjunctive, although 120 member-countries of the United Nations have supported a resolution with the demand for an immediate stop to and a ban on nuclear tests. The three countries that voted against were the United States, Britain, and France. Washington was the one that set the tune.

Should it respond favorably to Moscow's good-will proposals, the deadlock over the issue would be broken. I have an urge to call the United States a no man, for it has so far rejected all efforts aimed to curb the arms race. It seems that the American administration is trying to save its face in the time left before the new year. However, Secretary of State George Shultz, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger, and their associates have failed to come out with anything that would suit the occasion. Washington's allegations that the Soviet Union is ahead of the United States as to the number of nuclear explosions carried out and that the moratorium would be unverifiable have collapsed like a pack of cards. This propagandistic maneuvering has shown the weakness and vulnerability of Washington's position. American military experts have said that the United States since 1945 has carried out 771 nuclear weapon tests, which is nearly one-third more than the Soviet Union.

Washington's officials can say whatever they like, but it is a fact that Moscow has supported the idea of international control to verify a moratorium. It is also a fact that Moscow has received with approval the proposal of Argentina, Mexico, Greece, India, Tanzania, and Sweden that their territories be used to set up observation posts that would see to it that a ban on nuclear weapon tests is observed. The Soviet Union has also accepted some specific measures of control Washington has so much insisted on. But the American administration has turned a blind eye to these facts and to good-will gestures on the part of the USSR. The Americans keep repeating the hackneyed statements about what they call window of vulnerability of the United States and about lagging behind the Soviet Union. This is the tactic they used in 1955 and 1958, when they rejected all the calls from Moscow for putting an end to the tests of nuclear weapons.

In 1980 Washington, on the same pretext, walked out of negotiations between the USSR, the United States, and Britain whose aim was to work out a treaty on a comprehensive nuclear-weapon-tests ban. It used the time-out to modernize warheads for the Pershings, Tomahawks, MXs, and Tridents. Meanwhile it is evident that if Washington turned an attentive ear to Moscow's calls all of us, Britons, Americans, Russians, would now live in a much safer world. In that case neither side would be able to hold nuclear tests and consequently modernize the existing systems of weapons of mass destruction and develop new ones, ever more destructive.

The United States has carried out five nuclear explosions, one together with Britain, since the Soviet Union announced the unilateral moratorium.

The Pentagon makes no secret about the fact that these explosions are needed in the first place to carry out the star wars program, which the United States is going to use in still another attempt to gain military supremacy over the Soviet Union. The sad truth is that London in the situation doesn't have a say in such matters and cannot point to the short-sightedness of the American administration.

Soviet Scientists Appeal

LD231821 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1720 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 23 Dec (TASS)--The committee of Soviet Scientists in Defense of Peace and Against the Nuclear Threat has published an appeal in connection with the expiry at the end of the year of the moratorium on nuclear tests announced by the Soviet Union. We appeal to you, American scientists, first and foremost to the leaders and staff of major laboratories, the document says, to be aware of your responsibility in continuing the search for new means of destruction. Today we have experiments aimed at the creation of beam weapons triggered by a nuclear explosion, and about the inclusion of them in the SDI program despite assurances that this allegedly defensive system should be carried out by nonnuclear means. Thus, conditions are being created for the destabilization of strategic parity, for the direct violation of important international treaties which limit the arms race at present.

The opponents of stopping nuclear tests also bring up arguments about verification. It is well known that over the past few years the development of seismometry has lowered the threshold of discovery of nuclear explosions, even by national means, to 1 kilotonne. The latest Soviet proposals for on-site inspection leave not the slightest doubt of the feasibility of monitoring, whatever dreamed-up demands it is approached with.

At the Geneva meeting it was stated that both sides were not seeking strategic superiority. Indeed, the development of nuclear weapons has been going on for more than 40 years; the knowledge and experience built up in this also exceed rational limits, just as the stocks of weapons themselves do. It is time to realize that it is not new inventions of more and more new weapons which leads to security and ensuring peace. What is at issue is not a technical, but a political solution, the appeal stresses. It is precisely for this reason that mankind is waiting for self-limitation on the part of the nuclear powers, primarily the USSR and the United States.

We are appealing to President Reagan and to the U.S. government. Today, the peoples of the world and the Soviet people are waiting for a simple and clear reply from the American side to the Soviet initiative on halting the tests. The new year of 1986 could become a year of hope, a year when resolute steps were taken on excluding nuclear weapons from the future of history.

Joint Step Urged

LD232047 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Opinion polls in the United States show that about 80 percent of Americans are in favor of reaching agreement between the USSR and the United States on an immediate and verifiable prohibition on tests and production of nuclear weapons. Here is PRAVDA'S foreign news editor, Tomas Kolesnichenko:

Good evening comrades. This year is ending marked by the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. Now a very crucial time has arrived; real and practical steps are needed to develop the useful results of Geneva. There, the leaders of the USSR and the United States stated clearly in a joint document: A nuclear war must never be started; there can be no victors in it. If this is so, then why, one may ask, build further mountains of nuclear weapons, improve them, and further crank up the arms race. Another thing is also obvious; in order to stop it we need to stop all nuclear tests. If there are no tests, then there will be no improvement or modernization of new systems of destructive weapons, and this would fully correspond with what is now being called worldwide the Spirit of Geneva.

As is known, the Soviet Union has appealed to the United States for a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions. How does Washington react? There has been no official response as yet. However the reaction, let us say frankly, is negative. White House spokesman Speakes said for example that the issue of stopping nuclear tests cannot, according to him, be resolved until substantial cuts in nuclear arsenals of the sides are achieved. However, if one follows such logic, if I can use that word, then the establishment of a mutual moratorium would be postponed indefinitely, all the more so since nuclear tests are necessary for the Pentagon--and Washington is not concerning this--not to cut, but to improve its nuclear arsenals.

A spokesman for the Union of Concerned Scientists of America, [name indistinct] stated plainly yesterday: Refusal by the administration to stop nuclear tests is significantly explained by the fact that the United States is modernizing its nuclear arsenal. Nor does the following argument by the Pentagon stand up to criticism: A moratorium, they say, will lead to the obsolescence of American nuclear weapons, and thus will cause substantial damage to U.S. national security. But a moratorium concerns both sides. Back in August, the Soviet Union declared its unilateral moratorium, thus, it cannot be said that the Soviet Union is gaining something as a result of the moratorium, while the United States is losing. The sides are on an equal footing.

There is one more factor: Earlier, they were saying in Washington that a moratorium is hard to monitor, according to them, and therefore unrealistic. But now that the Soviet side, apart from the national means of checking--which, incidentally are quite reliable--has supported the idea of using an international verification system. We have gone even further; we are for agreeing with the United States, under a mutual moratorium, on certain measures of on-the-spot verification. The whole world is beginning to believe that talk of verification was needed by Washington only to divert attention.

There are no reasons why the Soviet Union and the United States could not take a joint step to stop nuclear tests; there simply are none. However, if the United States joined in the Soviet moratorium, this would be a real and practical step to develop the positive results of Geneva and would give a strong impetus to the whole process of talks on nuclear and space weapons which will be continued in January next year in Geneva. In short, both sides would win, but most importantly, the process of eliminating the arms race and the danger of a nuclear catastrophe on earth would be underway.

'Positive Answer' Urged

LD231937 Moscow TASS in English 1927 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 23 TASS--TASS political news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes:

The Soviet Union's readiness to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions, should the USA reciprocate such a move, the fresh Soviet proposal ensuring the effectiveness of control for the observance of such a moratorium have been met by world public opinion with profound gratification. Broad support for the important Soviet initiative on all continents is a striking proof of the fact that it is in the vital interests of all peoples to end nuclear testing. They see in that initiative a unique chance to make the moratorium mutual both on the part of the USSR and on the part of the USA, to extend it after January 1.

It will be no exaggeration to say that on these days on the eve of the new year the world public shows special resolve in demanding an end to nuclear tests--to eliminate that source of nuclear weapons race, of a growth of tensions and threat of war. Albeit, there is a little more than a week to go before January 1, people expect Washington to respond to the desires of people the world over.

The Soviet initiative concerning an extension of the moratorium calls for a positive answer from Washington, the British newspaper OBSERVER says. The Soviet Union's proposals, the American newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR points out on its part, deserve a most serious examination by the U.S. administration.

Yet, apparently, Washington does not wish to display a serious approach to the question of a moratorium on nuclear explosions, albeit the U.S. administration cannot help seeing that given political will and desire for a constructive resolution of that issue, specific, weighty and tangible results can be achieved already now.

The American NEWSWEEK weekly stresses that the Soviet Union's proposal on some measures of control for the observance of the moratorium has destroyed the argument used by the Washington administration in refusing to join in the moratorium. Indeed, the specific measures proposed by the Soviet Union, make the question of control quite feasible.

But the real point is by no means the question of control. The British SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, the U.S. ABC television company and many other news media believe that the Pentagon insists on continuing nuclear testing for the perfection of the whole complex of new types of weapons, including space strike systems. It is precisely these aims that determine the stand of Washington, in refusing to join in the moratorium.

Loud Public Demand

LD241842 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Vitaliy Sobolev commentary]

[Text] The Soviet proposal, addressed to the United States, concerning a mutual moratorium on nuclear tests, has met with extensive support throughout the world. Prominent politicians and public figures in many countries, foreign mass media, emphasize that the acceptance of the proposal would be tantamount to taking a real step along the path of curtailing the arms race, constituting a weighty measure which would give a powerful stimulus to the entire process of talks on nuclear and space arms, becoming a real contribution to the cause of implementing the accords reached during the Geneva meeting of the USSR and U.S. leaders.

Here is the latest news' commentary--Vitaliy Sobolev is at the microphone:

The moratorium--that is to say, a temporary halt to all nuclear explosions--met with due appraisal throughout the world the moment it was unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union. However, at present, since no positive reply was forthcoming from the United States, the actions in support of the moratorium, mass, individual and public actions, private letters and petitions to the Washington figures have spread throughout the planet. People demand that the opportunity of putting a halt to nuclear tests created by our country should be grasped. And, as is now being emphasized everywhere, this opportunity is fully realistic. After all, substantial steps have already been taken along this path. As long ago as in 1963, a treaty banning tests of nuclear arms in the atmosphere, space, and under water was signed in Moscow. In 1974, the Soviet-American treaty on limiting underground nuclear

tests was concluded. True, it has so far not been ratified in Washington, just as the 1976 treaty on peaceful nuclear explosions has not been ratified, either.

However, in 1977, the Soviet-British-American talks began, at our country's initiative, to prepare a treaty on a complete and universal ban on nuclear arms tests. It was found possible to agree on numerous important provisions.

Since the Western participants broke off the talks, the situation in the world has taken a tangible turn for the worse and the necessity of halting nuclear tests has become more acute. The understanding of this fact is behind the current rising tide of the campaign of the world public in support of the Soviet moratorium.

If during the Geneva talks both sides agreed that nuclear war should not be unleashed, then it is logical to expect also a mutual agreement to suspend nuclear tests.

In reply to the American side's demands and arguments, concerning, for instance, the measures of control, the Soviet Union, time and again showing good will, has already taken a number of steps meeting the American side half-way. It is perfectly obvious--and this is currently being noted everywhere--that the delay is due to the political will of the Washington leadership.

Judging by the U.S. press, Washington is trying to soften the undesirable impression caused in the country and elsewhere by the stubbornly negative U.S. position with regard to the moratorium. The paper NEW YORK TIMES quotes some administration representatives who see in the Soviet initiative a potentially positive development of events, a seed that can be cultivated. The paper LOS ANGELES TIMES, citing officials, even reports Washington's possible agreement to resume talks on banning nuclear tests.

But even if this is true, would the moratorium not create favorable conditions to move toward this goal? In any circumstances, the Soviet proposal to the United States concerning a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions should be accepted.

Washington cannot fail to hear this loud demand of the world public.

'Road to Happy Future'

LD241851 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 24 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by Academician Velikhov]

[Text] [Announcer] In connection with the expiry at the end of the year of the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on nuclear testing, statements in defense of

peace have been made by Soviet scientists participating in the international Pugwash movement, the Soviet Committee of War Veterans, the Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Links with Foreign Countries, and Soviet journalists. Taking part in our program is Academician Velikhov:

[Velikhov] During the Geneva summit meeting the leaders of the United States and the Soviet Union said that both sides view nuclear conflict as the supreme catastrophe, and that this conflict must be prevented at any price, that neither one side nor the other seeks strategic supremacy, advantage, over the other. The touchstone by which one can verify the sincerity of these statements is, first and foremost, the issue of stopping nuclear tests. The thing is, that the nuclear arms race is taking place both in quantity and in quality, but in the quantitative respect we have already reached the limit, and this is understood by all. With 50,000 nuclear warheads, every person is sitting on the equivalent of almost 5 metric tons of explosive, what more then can there be?

Unfortunately, in recent years the qualitative race has been run very actively on the U.S. side, and this has led to destabilization of the nuclear balance. And it is the stopping of this race, stopping it in the future, the ban on all nuclear tests and nuclear explosions on our planet, that is a most important issue which truly leads along the road toward nuclear disarmament, and to stability.

What forces today are impeding this? Well, first of all, it is those extreme rightwing forces in the United States which are not satisfied with the nuclear parity and which are seeking one way or another out of this situation. It must be said directly that there is no way out today, and generally speaking, probably, they themselves understand that these attempts are sufficiently hopeless. But, of course, a struggle is in store here, a struggle of convictions and a political struggle. Unfortunately, there is a considerable group of scientists affiliated to that political group. These are opportunist scientists, employees in the nuclear laboratories of the United States. We know a bit about them, we know their names, for the most part. They assert that one way or another nuclear testing is necessary for the security of the United States, and they convince the government of this. We hope that conscience will awaken in them, that feelings of responsibility to the generations which handed on to us the knowledge, science, and culture which created our civilization and to those generations which are yet to live, will be aroused. But, you know, this group does exist.

Finally, there are certain demagogic statements. These are, first and foremost, statements that cessation of nuclear testing does not lend itself to verification. Today, this is a completely unfounded statement. The most recent research by geophysicists, both Soviet and U.S. geophysicists, shows that even national means, deployed on the countries of other countries, make it possible reliably to register explosions right up to the level of one kiloton. These are very small explosions in modern terms, and it must be said that Soviet leader, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, has repeatedly said that there are no impediments to the organization of the necessary verification. We welcome international verification; we also welcome, and are opening up the possibility for the necessary siting of the means of verification on Soviet territory too, and are also very interested in deployment of the means of verification on U.S. territory, in the event of the cessation of tests.

So, the road is clear. We hope that the U.S. Administration, seeing the immense movement, the immense force that is now taking up the wish of the peoples to stop nuclear testing and to stop the qualitative nuclear arms race, under pressure from public

opinion and understanding its responsibility for the future, will agree to the cessation of nuclear tests and thus, finally, more than 40 years after the first nuclear test on this planet, nuclear testing will be stopped once and for all, and the road to survival will be truly opened up, the road to a happy future for all mankind.

Moratorium 'Canceled' If U.S. Fails to Join

LD281029 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 28 Dec 85

[Excerpts] In the last 5 months the Soviet Union has exploded no nuclear devices for either military or peaceful purposes. Its moratorium, called on 6th August, will be effective until the end of this year, but may last longer if the United States responds in kind. What's the advantage of imposing a joint Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear testing? What effects might this have on international security? And how effective could verification be? We take up these and other matters in the following program. [name of program and participants not given]

[Question] How is the Soviet Union going to act if the United States fails to join its moratorium by 1st January?

[Answer] In that case this country would cancel its moratorium. After all the United States has yet to ratify the agreements it signed with the Soviet Union in the mid-seventies on limiting nuclear tests. It's failed to respond to the Soviet offer to freeze the testing and production of nuclear weapons on a mutual basis. What's more, the United States is not only refusing to join the Soviet Union but is stepping up its nuclear weapons tests, including those of the space system. This compels the Soviet Union to look carefully after its safety and that of its friends and allies. But this country firmly believes that now is the time to stop nuclear testing. This would be quite feasible if done on a mutual basis.

'Perverted Logic' Questioned

LD091054 Moscow TASS in English 1045 GMT 9 Jan 86

["Problem of Tests and Washington's Declarations" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 9 TASS -- TASS commentator on military matters Vladimir Bogachev writes:

On the eve of the New Year 1986, forty-four American senators -- almost a half of the highest legislative body of the USA -- urged President Reagan to take advantage of the favourable atmosphere following the Geneva summit for resuming talks with the Soviet Union on banning all nuclear weapon tests. Noting the Soviet Union's restraint in the matter of nuclear explosions and its expressed readiness to have such talks without delay, the senators ask the President: Why not see whether some accomodation could be reached?

The U.S. Administration has not yet given any meaningful reply to this question of the American legislators. To judge by Washington's reaction to the Soviet Union's large-scale initiatives, it does not suit Washington to have a resumption of tripartite talks on complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapon tests, a moratorium on nuclear explosions or an international system for verifying its observance.

Washington admits that termination of tests would raise a barrier in the way of development of new systems of mass-destruction weapons and improvement of old ones. That is exactly the main thing in the Soviet initiatives resented by the apologists of a "tough policy" towards the countries of the socialist community.

U.S. official representatives say the American side will be ready to negotiate a ban on nuclear explosions only after it completes the modernization of U.S. nuclear weaponry which, they insist, must be tested before this could be done. Meantime the purpose of termination of nuclear weapons testing is to make the arsenals of mass-destruction weapons obsolete and dead by preventing their modernisation and improvement.

Officials in Washington, displaying perverted logic, insist on reaching accomodation with the Soviet Union concerning some "regimentation" of an arms race in space but refuse to discuss in earnest the question of preventing an arms race in space, suggest legalising nuclear explosions and regard a ban on nuclear weapon tests as "premature."

Following its customary practice of using a "double standard", representatives of ultra-right-wing circles divide arms systems into "good" ones which, they say, must be tested, and "bad" which must be reduced. They regard as "stabilising" systems the nuclear armaments of the USA and as "destabilising" the deterrent possessed by the Soviet Union.

The Soviet peace initiatives for banning nuclear explosions have opened before the U.S. Administration realistic opportunities for demonstrating in deeds, and not just in words, the sincerity of its declarations on its desire to make nuclear weapons impotent and obsolete.

Mankind has every right to expect that common sense in Washington would prevail over illusory considerations of military superiority.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR ATTACKS WASHINGTON'S REJECTION OF MORATORIUM

U.S. Disregards Public Opinion

LD201445 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 20 Dec 85

["Washington Rejecting a Moratorium on Nuclear Tests"--TASS headline]

[Text] Paris, December 20 TASS--The National Council of the French Peace Movement has issued a statement for the press saying that on December 18, this year, the French Peace Movement addressed to President Ronald Reagan of the United States a message urging him to introduce a moratorium on nuclear tests already before the end of the year of 1985. From the viewpoint of the French Peace Movement, such a moratorium on the part of the United States and the moratorium already unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union, would be an important step towards putting an end to the nuclear weapons race. Now, after the Geneva summit meeting, in the opinion of the movement, it is necessary to take concrete measures directed at putting an end to the arms race. The appeal points out that the introduction of a moratorium will inevitably contribute towards a fruitful resumption of talks with the aim of putting an end to all nuclear tests.

Washington, December 20 TASS--In disregard of the opinion of the broad circles of international public, the United States has again rejected the idea of introducing a moratorium on nuclear explosions. A spokesman for the U.S. President said that the USA did not agree to a moratorium, and made it clear that the U.S. administration intended to carry on nuclear testing. According to that representative, the nuclear weapons testing conducted by the United States is required to ensure the "reliability and safety of the U.S. arsenal." Touching upon the "star wars" program, the spokesman for the White House said that along with work on that program, "nuclear weapons will remain for the foreseeable future the key element" of the U.S. nuclear potential. This means that, while declaring by word of mouth its wish to make the nuclear weapons "obsolete", Washington is planning in reality to combine the ground nuclear potential with space-strike weapons within the framework of the "star wars" program.

Commenting on the statement by the spokesman for the White House, observers stress that the Washington administration's refusal to join the Soviet Union

and ban all nuclear testing is predetermined by its policy of a further build-up of the nuclear potential of the USA, its quantitative and qualitative renewal.

U.S. Claims Verification Problems

LD202141 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] In a statement on Thursday, 19 December, a White House spokesman again turned down the Soviet invitation for the United States to join the moratorium on nuclear explosions. How do officials in Washington explain their position? They claim it is essential to make up for the [word indistinct] and they claim if the Soviet proposal is accepted the seal will be set on what they call Soviet unilateral advantages in the military field.

But consider this fact: In an official report to the Congress early this year, the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff reaffirmed the approximate balance of the nuclear arms possessed by the two nations. So what's all this talk of the USA lagging behind about? Or take another fact: When the Soviet Union suspended all nuclear explosions as of 6 August it ran a definite risk. It suspended its program for testing without completing it. Keep in mind that in the course of the year until the moratorium was announced, the USSR had carried out about as many explosions as the United States had. But although the Soviet Union suspended the tests, the United States has been continuing them and experts calculate it has already conducted almost three times as many test nuclear blasts this year as the Soviet Union. If we sum up the tests throughout the years of nuclear weapons, the United States has made by one-third more than the USSR and together with the other Western nuclear powers by a half more. These figures have been cited in the Western press.

You may remember that by Soviet initiative, nuclear tests have been suspended two times in the past and both times the United States returned to nuclear testing. When in 1963 a treaty was signed to ban the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, space, and under water, the USSR stood at the time too for stopping all nuclear tests, including under ground tests. But the United States, Britain, and France rejected the idea. If they had lended an attentive ear to the Soviet proposal, there would have been seven times fewer nuclear warheads in the present world. Let us not guess how accurate this calculation can be. But there is no denying that nuclear tests speed the development of new weapons. When the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency explained to the U.S. Congress why the administration did not want to suspend nuclear explosions, it alleged that nuclear tests are especially essential for developing, modernizing and checking the readiness of warheads and for maintaining the reliability of the available stockpiles and assessing the consequences of nuclear weapons employment.

The Pentagon has found another use for nuclear tests. The newspaper WASHINGTON POST has said that the Pentagon is pressing for $100 million worth of additional appropriations to speed up under ground nuclear explosions during which devices for the development of space arms will be tested. The $100 million are to be added to the $282 million that the Pentagon already has received from Congress.

The United States has been claiming moratorium verification problems. Experts have proved that national technical facilities can register practically any nuclear explosion and locate it with an accuracy of 10 to 20 km. The Soviet Union is ready to follow an international verification system as well. It is ready to go even further: to set a mutual moratorium on nuclear blasts now and at the same time to agree with the United States on certain measures of local verification to remove any doubt in the observance of such a moratorium. These are some of the facts that can help better understand why nuclear explosions are still continuing.

'Still Time' to Review Position

PM201709 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Dec 85 First Edition p 3

[A. Mozgovoy article under rubric "Ban Nuclear Testing!": "But Washington Is Against It"]

[Text] A spokesman for President R. Reagan has communicated that the United States "is not agreeable" to introducing a moratorium on nuclear explosions. He stressed that the United States intends to continue nuclear testing. It is planned to conduct these routine tests under the codename "Goldstone" this month within the framework of experiments to create x-ray lasers for American space-based strike complexes.

During a recent talk with Professor B. Lown, American co-chairman of the international movement "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War," Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stated our country's willingness to extend the moratorium on nuclear explosions if the United States were to reciprocate. The Soviet moratorium, which has been undertaken on a unilateral basis since 6 August this year, has been highly appraised by the international public. And if the USSR's example were to be followed by other nuclear states, and primarily the United States, it would be possible to stop the endless movement of nuclear weapons and lead to a virtual necrosis [omertvleniye] of nuclear stockpiles.

However, the United States has responded to the Soviet peace initiative with nuclear tests. And now it has officially declined the proposal for a moratorium. How is all this to be interpreted?

The American military-industrial complex has launched a real attack on the results of the recent summit meeting. Right-wing circles in the United States do not wish the Geneva accords to be implemented. Anti-Soviet

hysteria in the U.S. mass information media is gathering momentum. The Pentagon is generously handing out contracts to the monopolies for implementation of the "star wars" program. The latest types of weapons and nuclear devices are undergoing tests. They are trying to counter common sense and a policy of realism with an unbridled militarist course.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA has already reported that 30 congressmen have opposed the holding of the "Goldstone" tests. But it has not been deemed necessary to take their opinion into account. Now the Pentagon is really persecuting members of the Conference Committee of the Congress' Senate and House of Representatives who have recommended totally annulling the American program for antisatellite weapons. Absurd accusations of "undermining the arms control process" and "inflicting damage on national security" are being brought against them. Unfortunately, the White House has taken the side of the Pentagon rather than that of sober-minded legislators.

Rejection of the moratorium on nuclear explosions attests that the American administration is as yet not taking any real steps in the "Spirit of Geneva." But there is still time for Washington to be able to review its position and make a nuclear moratorium mutual. As M.S. Gorbachev noted in his talk with B. Lown, it would be at the very least unreasonable to let slip this chance which paves the way to a definitive ban on all nuclear weapons tests fixed by treaty.

U.S. To Continue Testing

LD232129 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 23 Dec 85

["Washington Intends To Carry On Nuclear Testing"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, December 23 TASS--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatentko reports:

On the eve of the expiry of the term of the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which was unilaterally announced by the Soviet Union, the administration and a number of bourgeois mass media are trying to convince the public that if Washington responds to the USSR calls, and joins in the moratorium, this will, allegedly, jeopardize the security of the USA. As is known, the term of the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union, is from 6 August 1985 to 1 January 1986. Yet, the Soviet Union is ready to extend the moratorium, on condition that the USA joins in it.

The U.S. administration has recourse to various maneuvers in motivating its refusal to follow the Soviet Union's example. Thus, it refers to a lack of agreements between the USSR and the USA in the field of arms control that would ensure verification and control. On top of that, the U.S. administration has prepared for the Congress, many of whose members declare for an end to nuclear testing, a fresh "report" on alleged "Soviet violations" of the SALT-II and ABM treaties. This was reported by the

newspapers WASHINGTON POST and THE NEW YORK TIMES, leading television companies. Speaking in the morning news program of the CBS television company on 23 December, Kenneth Adelman, director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, reaffirmed that the "report" had already been sent to the Congress and would soon be partly published.

He said that the USA does not intend to join in the moratorium since the data cited in the "report" is evidence, as he put it, that the USA cannot reach any agreements with the Soviet Union without creating a verification and control mechanism. Yet, the real causes behind the reluctance of the USA to end nuclear explosions are contained in the admission of Adelman himself, who said that the United States "must" carry on the current series of nuclear weapons testing.

Commenting on this stand of the administration, representatives of the Center for Defense Information, a research organization, stress that the "arguments" of control and verification have nothing to do with the problem of ending nuclear testing, since with the present-day level of technology for the control over the observance of the moratorium or a formal agreement on ending nuclear testing, the national means of observance, which both the USA and the USSR have, such as satellites and seismic stations on land and at sea, are quite enough.

The reluctance of the U.S. administration to join in the moratorium is explained in a very simple way: Behind it is the striving to continue perfecting the building up the nuclear arsenals, carrying out work for the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative". It is precisely within the SDI initiative, that a nuclear device is to be tested in the Nevada proving range soon. The planned nuclear explosion with a yield from 20 to 150 kilotons, which is to be conducted as soon as weather conditions permit, has been officially announced by the U.S. Energy Department. According to experts, the device to be tested, is designed to pump energy into a space laser weapon.

Bernard Lown, American co-chairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, which was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize, has addressed on a CBS television news program today the U.S. administration with a call for an immediate end to all nuclear blasts and for joining in the moratorium.

TASS Notes Rejection

LD241907 Moscow TASS in English 1903 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 24 TASS--Washington has again rejected the idea of a moratorium on nuclear explosions. According to the UPI news agency, a high-ranking spokesman of the U.S. administration today excluded a possibility of the introduction by the U.S. of a moratorium on underground nuclear explosions. Washington is trying to justify its utterly non-constructive stand with references to the alleged need for the

U.S. to maintain the effectiveness and reliability of the nuclear potential. However, observers believe that the main reason for the U.S. refusal to institute a moratorium is the "star wars" program. Some of the weapon systems which are being created within the framework of the program and which are intended for being launched into outer space are based on the principle of using the energy of nuclear explosions.

U.S. Rejection Due to SDI

LD241537 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 24 TASS--by TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomaryov.

Representatives of the coalition of public organizations favoring a total ban on nuclear tests, at a rally in Washington last Monday, demanded that the U.S. administration give a positive response to the Soviet moratorium proposal.

The U.S. public are greatly alarmed by the Washington administration's stance on the moratorium issue. The U.S. Government insists on the continuation of nuclear explosions with a view to developing new types of armaments, above all space strike weapons.

Way back in August this year, the Soviet Union unilaterally suspended all nuclear blasts, urging the United States to do likewise. As announced, the Soviet moratorium will remain in force till 1 January 1986, but can be extended further on if the United States joins the moratorium.

They in Washington do not conceal, however, that the American side needs nuclear tests for implementing its "star wars" program, presented as a "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI).

THE NEW YORK TIMES admits that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" apparently exceeds its official title. America, according to the newspaper, joins the race of high technology, and the "star wars" program is being rapidly advanced. Preparations are under way within the program framework for conducting a nuclear test to power an x-ray laser. Such weapons integrated into the system are expected to be deployed in low orbit and in outer space.

THE WASHINGTON POST newspaper draws attention to the fact how the administration camouflages SDI and nuclear weapons within the "star wars" program, intended for positioning in outer space, by assuring the public that this will be a "non-nuclear" defense system. The newspaper points out that the x-ray laser represents a nuclear weapon within the framework of what the administration describes as a "non-nuclear" defense system allegedly designed to make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete".

Washington's deception becomes exposed as soon as one starts considering concrete types of weapons that are being developed within the framework

of the "star wars" program. Twice as much money was allocated for its implementation in the new financial year compared to fiscal 1985. Moreover, American observers acknowledge that highly-placed officials in the administration and most presidential assistants seek to ensure that no future arms control agreement affect the "star wars" program.

Announcing its unilateral moratorium on all types of nuclear explosions, the Soviet Union proceeded from the premise that the termination of nuclear tests is a question on which concrete and tangible results can be achieved.

They in Washington do not as yet back up their pronouncements of peace by concrete deeds.

U.S. Reaction 'Regrettable'

LD261501 Moscow TASS in English 1302 GMT 26 Dec 85

["The Chance Shall Not Be Missed" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 26 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksey Fedorov writes:

No task is more urgent and topical in present-day international politics than that of strengthening peace on earth and lessening the threat of war.

To achieve that aim it is necessary above all to put an end to the many-years old arms race, i.e. halt, as a matter of fact, the process of material preparations for war.

The realities are such that now, if there is political preparedness for it, there is also every chance to take concrete steps to apply the brakes on the rivalries in the nuclear field and start the process of disarmament. An end to the nuclear weapons tests could be one of such measures.

Driven by the wish to set a good example and place the resolution of this issue on a practical footing, the Soviet Union is known to adopt unilaterally a decision on halting as of August this year all nuclear explosions in its territory. At the same time, it urged the U.S. Administration to respond to that goodwill gesture, and, in its turn, give up further nuclear experiments, i.e. make the moratorium on nuclear explosions a bilateral action.

An uninformed person may ask the question: Wherein is the value of such a moratorium? The answer is simple enough: Both the United States and the Soviet Union would benefit tremendously from an end to nuclear explosions.

First, the introduction of a moratorium would put up a barrier in the way of a further perfection of new, even more destructive nuclear weapons systems, while the existing such systems would be, in absence of testing, doomed to gradually become obsolete and, in the final analysis, would wither away.

Second, the psychological effect would be exceptionally favourable. A mutual Soviet-American moratorium on nuclear explosions would signal the start of real progress on the way to nuclear disarmament.

Thus, a signal would also be given to the other states possessing nuclear weapons. A fundamentally new political situation would emerge and contribute to the implementation of the decisions in the field of strengthening security, which would be taken in the course of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva.

That is precisely why the introduction by the Soviet Union of a moratorium on nuclear explosions and our appeal to the USA to join in it met with broadest support the world over. Suffice it to recall in this connection the recent decision of the U.N. General Assembly, the statements by prominent scientists -- Nobel Peace Prize laureates, and other prominent public figures and statesmen, mass actions of peace champions in other countries.

On the last days of the outgoing year of 1985, the question of an end to nuclear explosions is becoming a particularly urgent one, since there are a few days to go before the expiry of the Soviet moratorium on January 1, 1986. Judging by the statements made in Washington, the idea of a mortatorium does not seem to be a welcome one there. This is regrettable.

A chance yet remains to reach agreement and arrange on a bilateral basis for an end to nuclear explosions. This takes only one thing -- The U.S. Administration should heed the voice of public and demands of all honest people the world over.

The possibility to make a real step for the benefit of peace should not be missed.

U.S. Failing to Display 'Goodwill'

LD262349 Moscow TASS in English 2341 GMT 26 Dec 85

["Nuclear Explosions and International Treaties" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 27 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Termination of tests of nuclear weapons would put an end to development of new and perfection of old systems of mass destruction. A ban on tests would lead to nuclear arsenals growing obsolete and extinct, specialists assert.

It is to be noted that consent with such conclusions is expressed both by those in favour of improvement in the climate of international relations and apologists of the U.S. "tough line" towards socialist countries. But the former use them as an argument in favour of the United States' acceding to the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions, while the latter -- as an argument to justify Washington's decision to continue tests of weapons of mass destruction.

Official representatives of the U.S. Administration declare they will be able to discuss termination of nuclear explosions only after the completion of modernisation of American nuclear systems, which, they say, must be tested. The peace champions rightfully object, saying that the whole meaning of termination of nuclear tests boils down to preventing these "modernisations" and thereby to remove the catastrophic threat of their application.

It is easy to trace a close link between the negative attitude of the U.S. Administration to the Soviet initiatives aimed at putting an end to nuclear explosions and the Pentagon's global strategic directives, the purposefulness and proportions of U.S. military preparations, including in the sphere of space strike armaments.

The fact that the United States will most likely decline the Soviet proposal on prohibition of underground nuclear tests is explained by President Reagan's decision to continue the controversial series of underground tests intended to develop a space laser gun put into action by nuclear explosions, writes the U.S. newspaper "NEWSDAY."

Since 1983 Washington has spent more than 300 million dollars for underground tests of a nuclear device for x-ray laser. These tests have so far brought unsatisfactory results from the viewpoint of efficiency of ABM weapons being developed. But influential circles in the U.S. Administration insist, as before, that these tests be continued, and they are pressing for new allocations for development of x-ray nuclear pumping lasers.

What is at issue is the development of an anti-missile laser weapon, equipped with a nuclear warhead of approximately 100 kilotons (a quantity which is five-six times greater than the atomic bomb which was dropped on Hiroshima in 1945). That system with a nuclear warhead is planned to be deployed on a space orbit around the earth.

Development of a space-based nuclear laser in the United States not only undermines prospects of concluding the treaty on universal and complete prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. That project is a violation of the functioning Soviet-American treaty on the limitation of ABM systems, which prohibits development, tests and deployment of space-based ABM systems or components.

The works to develop American nuclear laser also imperil the 1967 international treaty on the principles of activities of states in exploration and use of outer space, which makes incumbent upon the parties to the agreement not to put vehicles with nuclear weapons into an orbit around the earth.

The problem of ending nuclear explosions is a kind of a litmus-paper, which enables one to precisely judge about a real stand of that or other government on a whole package of questions of limitation and reduction of armaments.

Unfortunately, the U.S. Administration has not so far displayed good will in the question of termination of nuclear explosions.

U.S., Soviet Attitudes Contrasted

LD292356 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 29 Dec 85

[Commentary By Vladimir Tsvetov, political observer of Central Television and All-Union Radio; from the "International Diary" program]

[Text] Hope is memory and desire. You involuntarily turn to Balzac's cogent phrase when you think of the good and bold example of the Soviet Union, which has announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions. The hope for the liquidation of nuclear weapons, the prologue to which would be the United States joing the moratorium, is the memory of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the desire that the tragedy of the Japanese cities should never be repeated, all the more on a world scale. It was no accident, on the day of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima.

Happy New Year! Good Luck for the future! -- People are saying these days, linking good fortune with the hope that the world will finally become a safer place than it was a year ago. The activities on the nuclear testing range in the state of Nevada on the eve of the New Year are an attempt to kill peoples' hope. The 150-kiloton gift presented to people for new year by the United States was a reflection of the concept expressed by one of the former U.S. secretaries of state with a brevity also worthy of a pithy phrase: there are things rather more important than peace.

In the context of the nuclear age the phrase must be understood thus: there are things rather more important than life. And is there something more important than life? In the fevered consciousness of the military-industrial complex, which now rules the roost in the United States, it turns out that there is. Billions of dollars have been allocated by the U.S. Administration for the arms race, the preparation for star wars, and the test in Nevada was carried out in accordance with the program of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative. It is these dollars that seem more important than life to the military-industrial complex. Only, in the case of a nuclear war, which will leave no living thing on Earth, the mountains of dollars will appear to be so many Egyptian pyramids, majestic but useless.

Genuine optimism is will. The Soviet Union unfailingly demonstrates this, for whom there is nothing more important then peace. The appeal by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to let 1986 go down in history as the year of the eclipse of nuclear explosions showed throughout the will to achieve the realization of the hopes for new good fortune in the new year. But you cannot reach the goal without first setting out. The Soviet Union is ready to go its part of the way. Its unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions indeed bears witness to this readiness. The Soviet Union is ready to cover the next section, too, to agree to the most decisive measures of control, without which, in the conditions of a lack of trust, the halting of all nuclear explosions is impossible. The initiators of the nuclear explosion prior to new year can be likened to the literary figure who wanted to annoy people by stirring sand into seeds. However, the earth recognized the grain. The harvest grew. We too believe that our efforts to end all nuclear explosions will finally bear fruit.

U.S. Responses 'Mere Excuses'

PM021105 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Dec 85 Second Edition p 3

[Colonel M. Ponomarev "Military-Political Review": "Contrary to Common Sense"]

[Excerpts] From the viewpoint of basic common sense it is impossible to explain why official Washington is still stubbornly refusing to support the idea of a mutual moratorium on all nuclear explosions put forward by the Soviet Union. In fact this measure would have far-reaching consequences in keeping with the vital interests of all the peoples, including the U.S. people. There is no doubt that it would be greatly welcomed by the entire world public.

Official Washington has not yet given a positive response to the Soviet Union's appeal. It is still refusing to endorse the moratorium on nuclear explosions and to make it a mutual moratorium. Doing their utmost to justify their negative stance to the public, administration representatives place the accent on the verification question, referring to the lack of a proper verification system, difficulties with the identification of nuclear explosions, and so forth.

In fact, these are mere excuses. The national technical facilities that exist at the moment are sufficient for verification purposes. The Soviet Union graphically demonstrated this once again when recently it accurately determined the parameters of an unannounced U.S. underground nuclear explosion of very low yield.

Thus, it is not a question of the verification system, but of the political approach to the problems. The USSR also wants strict and reliable verification. We are just as keen on it as the United States. But the Soviet Union wants verification that nuclear explosions are not being carried out, that is, of the observance of a ban on them. The United States has continued to advocate monitoring the quality and yield of nuclear explosions, that is, their legalization.

But since it has a vital interest in making monitoring of nuclear tests more effective, the Soviet Union also supports the idea of an international system of verification.

To this end one could consider the proposal by the six states -- Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania, and Sweden -- on setting up special stations on their territories to monitor observance of an accord on halting tests. Again displaying its goodwill, the USSR is prepared to go even further. It is also amenable to the idea of reaching an accord with the United States on certain on-site verification measures. Those who have been placing special emphasis on this must now consider how the public regards their negative stance.

In an effort to justify its stance on nuclear explosions, the Washington administration frequently resorts to fabrications about the United States "lagging behind" the USSR in the nuclear research sphere. It is relevant here to mention some irrefutable facts that have become widely known of late.

In 1985 the United States carried out 15 nuclear explosions, including 6 that were officially announced after the USSR adopted its moratorium decision. Since 1951, 645 explosions have been carried out in the United States. Counting from 1945, 772 nuclear devices were tested in the United States through the end of 1984. The Soviet Union, which created nuclear weapons in the late forties, has tested 556 devices, that is, one-third fewer than the United States. So what is this U.S. "leg" they are talking about?

It is not a question of any mythical lag, of course. The point is that on the other side of the Atlantic influential forces actively oppose the cessation of nuclear explosions. For that reason the United States dare not endorse the Soviet initiative, even though it is conscious of being very much the loser politically in the eyes of all the peoples of the world.

There is an obvious desire on the part of the most aggressive, militarist U.S. circles to hinder the slight improvement in the international climate that occurred as a result of the Geneva meeting. These circles are still attempting to bank on confrontation, steering a course toward a further arms race spiral, and consoling themselves with the illusory hope of achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union.

One should add to this the military-industrial monopolies' avid pursuit of superprofits from the further expansion of arms production. When it comes to more and more new types of weapons and military equipment, the Pentagon's order books are bulging because of the militarist preparations.

The monopolies and the entire U.S. military-industrial complex are pinning special hopes on the so-called "star wars" program. More and more billions of dollars are being squandered on its implementation. In fiscal 1986 alone expenditure on the program is to double compared with 1985. And its full implementation could require trillions of dollars in appropriations. It was no accident that the U.S. BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIENTISTS wrote: "Had the military industry been asked to invent the most profitable alternative to arms control, it could not have imagined a better proposition than the 'star wars' plan."

Planning to deploy strike weapons in space orbits in the guise of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," the Pentagon is proceeding with their development at top speed. And priority is being given to the creation of an X-ray laser capable of destroying enemy targets both in space or in space trajectories and on earth. And the laser would be triggered or "pumped," as they sometimes say, by a nuclear explosion. Devices of this kind are currently being proved at a test site in Nevada, the U.S. press writes. The moratorium on nuclear explosions which the USSR is proposing could hamper this work.

Addressing the heads of diplomatic missions in the USSR at a meeting in the Kremlin, M.S. Gorbachev said: "Let us act in such a way that 1986 goes down in history as the year when nuclear explosions ceased. As the year when people summoned up enough common sense to be able to rise above narrow-minded, egotistical motives and stop mutilating their own planet."

This appeal was addressed primarily to the United States. There is still a unique opportunity to make reciprocal the moratorium on nuclear explosions unilaterally introduced by the Soviet Union. It would be reckless to say the least to miss this opportunity, paving the way to a final, treaty-based ban on all nuclear weapon tests. The solution of the question is in the hands of the U.S. Government.

U.S. Arguments Viewed

LD031918 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1810 GMT 3 Jan 86

["Explosions Instead of Arguments..." -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 3 Dec (TASS) [date as received] -- TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev writes:

Judging by the reaction of official representatives in Washington to the recent Soviet initiatives, the U.S. Administration likes neither the nuclear explosions moratorium, nor the international system for verifying its observance, nor the resumption of the tripartite talks on the complete and universal banning of nuclear weapons tests that were broken off in 1980.

A simple list of the "arguments" which the White House has put forward recently to justify its refusal of the Soviet offer to end nuclear explosions enables one to draw a conclusion about what meaning the U.S. Administration attaches to the thesis it itself declared on the "need to render nuclear weapons powerless and obsolete."

In August last year, in reply to the Soviet call that the United States should join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions, the U.S. side announced that "a great deal still has to be done in the sphere of verifying the observance of arms control agreements" before such a moratorium could be introduced and...[TASS elipses] it carried out another nuclear weapons test in Nevada.

After the USSR announced its willingness to take the most decisive steps with regard to monitoring, going so far as on-site verification, the U.S. Administration, evidently realizing that from now on this problem can no longer be over-emphasized as the main obstacle to its participation in an accord, sharply changed its "arguments" in favor of explosions. White House representatives began to assert that solving the verification problem alone is not enough. The United States quickly carried out another nuclear test.

In Washington they declared that the United States allegedly supports the idea of banning nuclear explosions, but that it is only willing to discuss this "when the modernization of the U.S. nuclear capability has been completed." The White House spokesmen were reminded that the whole significance of stopping tests lies precisely in preventing this very "modernization" of nuclear weapons and thus, in decreasing the threat of their being used.

Another "argument" against U.S. acceptance of the Soviet proposals that was hastily concocted also turned out to be without foundation -- the "canard" that the Soviet Union had allegedly carried out more tests than the United States and that the ending of tests would "freeze" Soviet superiority in this field. For it follows even from the official data that has been published in Washington that since the postwar period the United States has carried out at least one-third more nuclear tests than the USSR has. And if one includes the U.S. allies then the figure is 1.5 times greater.

The peoples of the world are right to demand that the U.S. Administration finally end its dangerous game of nudging our planet toward nuclear disaster and that it take up a sensible position on problems of limiting and reducing armaments--including the issue of banning nuclear explosions.

The year 1986 must go down in history as the year of the decline of nuclear explosions.

U.S. Logic Criticized

LD071931 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 7 Jan 86

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] When, last 28 December, the United States detonated a nuclear device in Nevada, the blast was part of the program to build components of space weapons using nuclear explosions as a source of energy. Here are some details:

Nothing has been left of the (?demogogy) about moratoriums on nuclear testing being unverifiable or that they serve no good purpose. If in Washington they ever were serious about halting the arms race and wanted to follow this country's example, they could agree to an international system of control in the form of seismic monitoring stations on the territories of Mexico, Sweden, Tanzania, Greece, Argentina, and India and to certain measures of on-site inspection.

Moratoriums on nuclear testing do serve a good purpose. The majority of military tests deal with new warheads and only a fraction of them are selective tests of the existing stockpiles. Therefore, without such testing, we could move towards gradually phasing out the nukes.

How long will nuclear testing continue? What is there to perfect? Do we need 20 warheads on 1 missile instead of the current 8, 10, or 14? Who needs a pocket-sized Hiroshima that could be easily concealed in some bag and detonated by radio control?

Such diabolic devices may appear in the future, but they won't be produced by mythical terrorists against whom we have to build multibillion space defenses. They'll be built by those who are working on space weapons. According to George Keyworth, who's said to be one of the main architects of "star wars," some space weapons may become operational in the early 1990's. Instead of placing a shield over America these arms would represent a lid over the Soviet Union. Mr Keyworth cited monumental breakthroughs made over the past years as evidence that his prediction might come true. So, if nuclear testing is so vital for some of those weapons, it's likely to continue for many years to come.

Those who built the atom bomb and dropped it on Hiroshima and Nagasaki 40 years ago offer humanity a safe existence in the form of battle platforms (?brimming with lasers) and kinetic guns, lids and shields comprised of particle beams, and other exotic weapons. But what for? Depending on the audience or occasion, it is to get rid of the nukes, to stop potential terrorists, and even to forget about the social and other differences and unite against an invasion by extra-terrestrials. How very clever. As if history is no guide, common sense is being sacrificed for an illusion: that strength and strength alone is the road to security. We're being told that since we've lived with nuclear arms for so long without tearing each other into pieces, there is nothing wrong in building other weapons. This is the logic of those who don't want to stop.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR ON REASONS BEHIND U.S. MORATORIUM STANCE

LD131535 Moscow World Service in English 0910 GMT 13 Jan 86

["Disarmament, the Issue of the Day" program presented by Vladimir Posner with Dr Bogdanov and Dr Sergey Plekhanov of the Academy of Sciences United States of America and Canada Institute]

[Text] [Posner] Today on the program, as usual, we have Dr Bogdanov and Dr Plekhanov of the USA and Canada Studies Institute, your host Vladimir Posner, and this is our first program in the New Year. And I believe it would be a very good idea for us to look at what I think to be -- and many share that opinion -- an extremely important problem question and that is the unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions that the Soviet Union announced as of 6 August, Hiroshima Day, last year and stated that it would follow this moratorium until 1 January, 1986, and then it could become a permanent one provided the United States joined the Soviet initiative. However, this has not happened and there have been different arguments from the United States as to why that country does not wish to meet the Soviet Union halfway. One argument says -- and that I would say, is the Far Right -- what's good for the Soviets is bad for the United States. Now how do you feel about that particular argument? Who wants to start?

[Bogdanov] Well, that argument is very well-known to us. If you come back down to the history of the Soviet-American relations then you may see that argument emerging every time when the other side -- to be frank with you, Vladimir -- has no argument about our argument. Then they say it's good for them, it's bad for us and vice versa. And I believe that in the present time when we all of us, we talk about the new thinking, new approaches to the foreign policy, to the Soviet-American relations, it sounds to me, to put it mildly, very strange and I believe my friend and colleague Sergey Plekhanov will talk about that a little bit more. I would like to call your attention to the very important argument of the American side when they say now, and they use it more and more, that we cannot trust the Soviet side. We would like to follow them, but we cannot trust them.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, that is the second argument that we were going to come to and let's certainly look at that. Have we fully explored this idea of what the Soviets like, we must dislike. Do you have anything to add to that before we go on to the second, very important, argument?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think (?zero sum game) reasoning in the nuclear age is a prescription for disaster. Plainly speaking, there are 50,000 nuclear weapons in the world today. Just 1 percent, exploding just 1 percent of that armada would be enough to produce the effect of nuclear winter, that is produce a shroud of soot and dust up in the air which would prevent effectively sun rays from reaching the earth and the whole planet will just freeze up, everything, plants, animals, not to say, not to mention, people.

So, it's very easy to imagine a situation where just 1 percent or even more of that would be exploded, so...

[Posner, interrupting] Which is in no one's interest.

[Plekhanov] Which is in no one's interest. So once you start to look at the nuclear competition from the point of view that we are in the same boat and that the planet is very fragile, I think this arguement just evaporates.

[Posner] Well, I would tend to agree with that. Back to you, Dr Bogdanov: and you say that there is this American argument that we'd like to do it, but you simply cannot trust the Soviets.

[Bogdanov] That argument is being used very often by the other side and I would like just to cite some facts. You know, I wouldn't like to argue on that, just (?telling) emotionally 'no'. They are entitled to trust. I would like just to cite some facts and to begin with, Vladimir, from the '45...

[Posner, interrupting] 1945?

[Bogdanov] 1945, 1945. All in all, according to the latest calculations, there were something like 100... [corrects himself] 1,600 nuclear tests? That's...

[Posner, interrupting] Outright? (?That's) all nuclear countries?

[Bogdanov] All nuclear countries, but the major part of these, as much as 800 nuclear tests, were produced by the Americans. Now they say that how can we trust the Russians if they have already violated once in the history of the Soviet-American relations the famous Eisenhower-Khrushchev agreement on stopping nuclear tests. But I, I would like to (?trust) very much, but it's nothing but the distortion of the historical facts. The facts are, and I would like to remind that to my American listeners over there, that on 31 December of 1959 President Eisenhower made the declaration that beginning from that moment United States feels free to resume nuclear tests and they will pursue an active program of nuclear tests [words indistinct] aiming at the creation of a new type of weapon. That was exactly what he said on the 31 December, 1959. Then we answered to that declaration of American President that we would not resume nuclear tests until they don't resume.

[Posner] Until they resume?

[Bogdanov] Until they resume. So we'll stick to that moratorium. But at that time it was already to test their nuclear weapons and in October 1959, France tested its nuclear weapon. And we tested ours in response to the Western resuming, in response to the West resuming their nuclear tests and after Eisenhower's declaration that they feel free. They don't stick any more to the moratorium. Now you have a case of very clear distortion of historical trugh. And because unfortunately the other side has a very short historical memory, there is an impression, and deliberately created impression, that we have violated this moratorium. As you see, there is no bit of truth in that. Now historians and politicians discuss, now discuss, why President Eisenhower did it. I believe there was a very important factor which made him to make this declaration and the same factor is being played just now. I just would like to come back to the history and to build a kind of a bridge between the past and the present. Why? Because there was a very big pressure on him from the Congress, from the Pentagon, and from the Commission on Atomic Energy to resume -- to resume American nuclear tests.

[Posner] Why?

[Bogdanov] Because they were already ready with the laboratory research, with new weapons, nuclear weapons,and they needed to test it, otherwise they couldn't deploy it.

[Posner] That reminds me of SDI a little bit.

[Bogdanov] Yes, yes,that's why I would like to build that -- that -- that, if you like that historical bridge. And mind you the biggest pressure was coming from Livermore Laboratory and from famous American scientist Dr Teller. He was, you know, in head of that pressure, organizing that pressure on President Eisenhower and there they had two arguments. One was that you cannot trust the Russians you see, they say, and the second argument was we need new weapons to deter Russians, and we have to test them. What puzzles me, to be frank with you, if there's anybody in this administration and maybe in the (ACDA) or in Pentagon and somewhere else who remembers all that, who is the bearer, if you like, of the historical truth?

[Posner] Yes.

[Bogdanov] I am afraid there is none, that's why you have these kind of distortions which are really no good, no good.

[Posner] Dr Bogdanov, if what you say is true then certainly the majority of our listners are also not familiar with that past history. So I'd like simply to sum up, very quickly the period you are talking about begins in March, 1958, when the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on all nuclear tests, this is 1958, March, and called, naturally, upon all the other nuclear club nations of the world to join in this moratorium, which did not happen. As a matter of fact, there was wide testing. Then in October of the same year the Soviet Union made a statement that it considered itself to be free of that self-imposed moratorium since no one, not one country, had really followed its lead. However, having said this, the Soviet Union did not test, it did not test until the summer of 1961. So in fact, for over 3 years the Soviet Union had no nuclear tests at all, which I think is very important to keep in mind.

Now to move into another question, the question of verification. The United States and the West time and again have said that that is the issue, that verification, the impossibility of verification, the problems of verification are what make it impossible to accept a total ban on nuclear tests. Now is this so? Dr Pleknanov, how would you handle that question? Is it really all that difficult?

[Plekhanov] No, it's not all that difficult and according to the best information available and to the analysis of experts in the field -- seismologists, nuclear physicists -- a nuclear explosion can very well be identified by the existing national technical means. However, there are some people who continue to advance the argument that national technical means, or NTMS, as they are called, are insufficient. And in response to that, there has been movement in bilateral relations, there has been movement in the Soviet position on the issue. In fact we, the Soviet Union and the United States and Britain, were in the process of negotiating a comprehensive test ban treaty. Those negotiations were broken off...

[Posner, interrupting] This was when?

[Plekhanov] Suspended -- that was in the late seventies -- and the negotiations were suspended in 1980. The treaty was ready 95 percent and one of the provisions dealt with verification.

According to the agreed provisions, in addition to national technical means there were to be installed certain types of equipment on the other side's territory which would monitor tests and would see to it that the treaty is not violated. Actually, the same kind of provision is now, has now been repeated in the statements by the Soviet Union concerning the possible conclusion of such a treaty. Now in 1981 the Reagan administration decided not to resume talks on the comprehensive test ban, so it was not our fault that work on the comprehensive test han was discontinued in the early 1980's.

But the important thing is that we continue to adhere to this policy on verification. Number one, national technical means can do the job perfectly well, but in addition to that there should be so-called black boxes -- equipment which one side installs on the territory of the other side in order to monitor the ban -- and thirdly, if there are doubts about the efficiency of that equipment or about any kind of activity, there should be observation teams sent to the other side.

[Posner] You're talking about checks on site?

[Plekhanov] On site, the ban on tests, on nuclear tests, so the verification issue doesn't exist. It's a non-issue, to the extent that it's being used, it's being used as a result of the public not being informed about the situation.

[Posner] Okay. So to sum up the verification problem as it were -- which is not a problem -- we have national means of observation, we have black boxes on each other's territories as a real possibility, we have on-site inspection when necessary, and I also think we should keep in mind the six countries -- Argentina, Mexico, Sweden, Greece, India and Tanzania -- that have offered their territories for monitoring stations that would be able also to monitor nuclear tests. Now then, we've looked at the different arguments, we've looked at the argument that says what the Soviets like we should dislike, we've looked at the argument you can't trust the Soviets, we've just now studied the argument about verification, have we missed anything?

[Bogdanov] Yes, we have missed one thing, because my, my, my belief is that we are talking a little bit too much on technicalities. I am sorry for that. But there is one very emotional side of this story; a very emotional, a very important one. Moratorium is important by itself of course, I agree with that there is no doubt. But there is another side, which is spirit of Geneva. What does it mean, spirit of Geneva? Does it need some support, does it need some blocks to build it really, to materialize it? Yes, of course, and moratorium is one of the stumbling -- you know -- one of the very important blocks in that spirit of Geneva. And, if you like it, it's a test of the goodwill of the sides taking part in the process of improving Soviet-American relations. For us moratorium -- will they join us or not -- is a testing ground; how they are sincere about improving, really improving Soviet-American relations and overall international environment. And number two, to be frank, I, I, you know, as a student of what is going on in the United States, I come to this very firm conclusion, that the story repeats in the sense that the building up of new arms, nuclear arms, is more important for this administration than ending the arms race. That's my conclusion, which is a very important one to my mind.

[Posner] Anything to add to that, Dr Plekhanov?

[Plekhanov] Well, it's a sad story, I have the same conclusion. In fact, in recent weeks, the arguments emanating from the U.S. Government on the issue of why not join the Soviet moratorium are more and more concentrated on a very simple and stark idea: that the United States needs to continue nuclear tests. And they say why they need it. They have a whole range of new offensive nuclear weapons that they want to test, to see whether they kill enough people or not. They'd be able to do enough damage. Then there is an important element of the SDI program. The "Star Wars" program has as one of its elements the laser, an x-ray laser which is supposed to work on the energy of a nuclear explosion.

So they want to carry out that test and the important thing to bear in mind is that if those tests of the laser are conducted in a close to real situation -- that is, up in the air -- that will be a violation of the existing 1963 treaty which bans all nuclear tests in the atmosphere. So it's not only the possibility of a new treaty, of a comprehensive test ban that is in danger from this program, but the existence of the old and time-tested prohibition on nuclear tests.

[Posner] So the bottom line really is that the military establishment in the United States simply needs to keep on testing, desires...

[Bogdanov] Let me -- let me interrupt for a while, Vladimir. I would put it like that: Political military establishments...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] Yes,

[Bogdanov] Two different...

[Plekhanov, interrupting] It's not just the military and you know -- the -- the problem is that there are people in power in Washington who want to keep the nuclear testing program. But I'm convinced that there are other people who are sensible enough to understand that there is a good chance, maybe the best chance in a generation now...

[Bogdanov, interrupting] A unique chance, a unique chance.

[Posner] Okay, at any rate you say that there are sensible people in the states and hopefully they will take advantage of this unique situation; it's something to look forward to.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1229

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

SOVIET GROUPS URGE U.S. TO SUBSCRIBE TO MORATORIUM

Moscow TV Interviews Public

LD192346 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 19 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; report over video]

[Text] The American mass media stress that the Soviet Union has again urged Washington to join in on a moratorium on nuclear tests. Our country came out with this initiative on 30 July of this year. The purpose of the moratorium is to halt the further build-up and improvement of nuclear arsenals. On the same day, as the whole world was marking the 40th anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima, the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions came into force. It has been proclaimed up to 1 January 1986. [Video shows extract from PRAVDA publication of statement and Soviet Hiroshima anniversary placards]

And although little time remains before the new year it is enough for a decision to be adopted on this question. The Soviet Union is prepared to extend the status of the moratorium if the United States supports this peace-loving act. [Video shows extract from Gorbachev's replies to a TASS correspondent published in PRAVDA on 14 August]

A joint Soviet-American moratorium could become an important and concrete step on the way to carrying out the positive results of the Geneva meeting. It is still not too late and vital to respond to the aspirations and hopes of all peoples, and the Soviet Union expects from the United States a constructive approach to this problem. [Video shows extract of PRAVDA report of Geneva meeting and photo of Shevardnadze and Shultz signing document]

This evening our correspondent conducted a number of short interviews with inhabitants of the capital and its guests from abroad. [Video shows Moscow traffic and passers-by: interview with young man in fur hat]

[V. Kalganov--video caption] The Soviet Government's decision is a very important one, and, in the main, the United States Administration is obliged to support us in order to preserve peace on earth.

[Correspondent S. Iyezuitov--video caption] Quite recently we witnessed the meeting in Geneva between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Reagan. What do you think? Will the spirit of Geneva live on?

[V. Galiulin--video caption] I believe that the spirit of Geneva will live in the hearts of all peoples, and there will be a hope for an improvement of peace throughout the world.

[S. Khoroshchev--viceo caption] Yes, this is a very, a pretty important peace initiative by our government and the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and it makes it clear that the Soviet Union is in favor of a peace settlement and, in general, for a ban on nuclear weapons.

[following in English with superimposed Russian]

[Correspondent Iyezuitov] One question please, what is your opinion of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear explosions?

[A. Selker, from Britain--video caption] Well, I think it is very much a step forward. It was made even in spite of a certain risk. But the Soviet Union has done so, and I believe that others should do the same.

[F. Kergen from the United States--video caption] Well, I don't know what to say. This is politics and I would not like to talk about politics on television.

[J. Sholtz from the United States--video caption] I think that it would e a good idea if everyone agreed to a moratorium and reduced the level of armaments they have. [end of passage in English with superimposed Russian translation]

USSR Committee for European Security

LD201726 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 20 Dec 85

["Ban Nuclear Weapon Tests"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 20 Dec (TASS)--The Soviet public which declares for the ensurance of security and development of cooperation in Europe supports the moratorium on all nuclear blasts announced by the Soviet Union on 6 August. This is said in a statement of the Soviet committee for European security and cooperation.

The document says that the peace forces view the Soviet Union's unilateral ending of nuclear tests as a manifestation of its sincere wish to break the vicious circle--to arrest the indefinite refinement of nuclear weapons, to bring about their actual deactivation. As is known, the Soviet Union is prepared to extend the operation of its moratorium on nuclear explosions if the United States answers with reciprocity.

The forces of peace, the statement says, are called upon to exert resolute pressure on the U.S. Administration so that the existing unique chance to make the moratorium bilateral be used and that the moratorium be extended further after 1 January, 1986. In this case a road would be opened to ultimate agreement on the ban on all nuclear weapons tests.

Friendship Group Cables Reagan

LD231434 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 23 Dec (TASS)--The Union of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries has sent a telegram to the President of the United States. On behalf of the broad Soviet public the organization urges President R. Reagan to review the official U.S. position and to join in the moratorium on nuclear weapons tests which was announced by the Soviet Union in August. The humane nature of this step by the USSR is obvious. It has been supported by broad circles of the world public. There can be no doubt that an end to nuclear weapons tests is an important component of the process of limiting the arms race and consequently leads to an easing of international tension and a strengthening of mutual trust and peace. If the U.S. joined in the moratorium, the telegram notes, this would help to strengthen security and would be a concrete expression of the desire of the United States, for peace, which has been mentioned more than once by the leader of the American administration, and would also facilitate the development of Soviet-American relations.

Academician on Environmental Consequences

LD231910 Moscow TASS in English 1703 GMT 23 Dec 85

["Dangers of Nuclear Explosions"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Dec (TASS)--The consent of the USA on a moratorium on all nuclear explosions could be an important step on the way of ending the nuclear weapons race, said academician Nikolay Dubinin, a prominent Soviet geneticist. Speaking in a TASS interview, the scientist recalled that the term of the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union in August this year will expire already at the end of this month. Yet, the USA has so far failed to meet halfway this peaceful initiative of the USSR, as if forgetting the dangers stemming to mankind from nuclear war and even from preparations for it.

It has already been proved that a nuclear conflict will cause such a change in the biosphere that can jeopardize mankind's very existence, academician Dubinin said. People should not forget about it, by whatever political concepts and ambitions they may be guided.

Suffice it to recall that nuclear blasts will kill a majority of people on earth, but the conditions of life for the survivors will become intolerable, as human environment will be strongly affected, he explained. Practically every survivor will become a chronic patient.

Even in peace time conditions, it is hard for mankind to preserve the environment clean and intact. Many countries are already making considerable efforts to eliminate industrial discharges into the atmosphere of various gases. In particular, of sulphur dioxide and carbon monoxide, which have a negative effect on the organism of human beings and animals. As follows from the findings of the Kiev Institute of General and [word indistinct] Hygiene, these gases increase several times the number of pulmonic cases. Ionizing radiation is a source of even much greater danger, as it destroys the genetic apparatus of cells adversely affecting the generations to come.

The placing of nuclear weapons in outer space will indisputably sharply deteriorate the situation and create the danger of pollution of outer space, and consequently, of the earth's atmosphere with radioactive particles in the case, for example, of an operator blunder, or a malfunctioning of the automatic weapons control system, Dubinin pointed out.

The dangers of nuclear weapons, whose race is continuing through the fault of the USA, are a matter of concern for the whole mankind. Hence, the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear explosions is approved all over the world. Now it is the turn of the U.S. Administration to act. To reverse the nuclear weapons race, it is necessary to end their testing, the academician said.

AUCCTU Statement

PM271119 Moscow TRUD in Russian 24 Dec 85 p 1

[AUCCTU Statement: "To Halt Nuclear Tests"]

[Text] The moratorium on all nuclear explosions, announced unilaterally by the Soviet Union, has been in effect since 6 August. It has received the broad support and approval of the planet's peace-loving forces and of the working people of all countries as a constructive and timely step to curb the arms race and reduce international tension.

All who value peace understand that there are no sensible arguments against banning all nuclear explosions. Those who seek military superiority and to achieve unilateral advantages try to invent such arguments. References to difficulties of monitoring will mislead no one. Given good will, it would be possible to resolve all problems relating to monitoring.

The moratorium expires in a few days. Our country has clearly stated that the moratorium can be extended. For this to happen, the United States must adopt a similar undertaking. It is precisely on the United States that the direction in which events will develop depends.

The working people and trade unions of the USSR are convinced that the extension of the moratorium would accord with the fundamental vital interests of the peoples of all countries. This would create real preconditions for resolving such burning problems of curbing the arms race as the freezing of nuclear arsenals, their gradual reduction down to their complete liquidation, and the prevention of the endless improvement of nuclear weapons. The funds released as a result of this could be channeled into raising working people's living standards, eliminating unemployment, improving working conditions and labor remuneration, developing social security and medical services, combating hunger and infant mortality, and protecting the environment and production surroundings.

On behalf of the 137 million members of Soviet trade unions the AUCCTU appeals to the U.S. Administration to subscribe to the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union. If the United States refuses to follow the USSR's good example, this will inevitably lead to the intensification of the arms race in one of its most dangerous directions, clouding the hopes of an improvement in the political climate in the world which all mankind acquired as a result of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva.

We urge the planet's democratic and progressive forces and the world's working people and trade unions to do everything to ensure that the United States and other nuclear powers heed the voice of reason and subscribe to the peace-loving Soviet initiative.

There is still time! A unique opportunity must not be missed! May the new year of 1986 be the first year without nuclear explosions on the earth!

Leningrad Citizens Interviewed

LD251831 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 25 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by A. Morgunov and R. Zhamgaryan, identified by screen caption]

[Text] A nuclear test moratorium is essential for the peoples of the world. Here is what citizens of Leningrad have to say about this. [streets shown crowded with pedestrians]

Most of these people, bustling with their New Year cares--so understandable from a human point of view--fortunately have never had to experience the trials of war. And, isn't their desire to always live in peace natural? It is quite understandable that they simply cannot remain indifferent to all that their motherland is doing to maintain peace on earth.

[Unidentified pedestrian] We all have our families and children, and we certainly wish with all our heart that they live in peace. Our country has always been a champion of peace, and this has manifested itself with ever greater force of late.

[2d pedestrian] Time is passing, and concrete measures must be taken. Our public wants the American public's support in this matter.

[3d pedestrian] The point today, probably, is not that the Americans need these nuclear explosions for some type of technological purpose, as they insist they do; the point is that there are universal human values which they are simply in no position to ignore.

[4th pedestrian] It appears to me that the nuclear test moratorium which the Soviet Union has declared--if the Americans would join this--will be one of the first stages in this cooperation, in the resolution of the problems that our countries face and to jointly seek a way out of this situation.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S ARBATOV EXAMINES U.S. ATTITUDE TO MORATORIUM

AU311405 Sofia RABOTNICHESKO DELO in Bulgarian 30 Dec 85 p 1, 4

[Interview given by "Academician Georgiy Arbatov" "specially for RABOTNICHESKO DELO" to APN special correspondent M. Ibruk in Moscow on 29 December: "There Are No Convincing Arguments -- the U.S. Position on Halting Tests"]

[Text] [Ibruk] How do you evaluate the U.S. Administration's reaction in connection with the Soviet proposal for halting nuclear tests, for extending the period of validity of the moratorium declared by the USSR, and for the United States to join in it?

[Arbatov] Naturally, I give a negative assessment to the U.S. reaction. But I want to believe that the regular "no" of Washington to the exceptionally important proposal for the limitation of nuclear weapons is not the last word of the United States.

[Ibruk] But what if it does turn out to be the last word and the United States does not halt nuclear weapon tests?

[Arbatov] This will intensify the arms race and all the consequences stemming from it: primarily, the increase in the threat of nuclear war. On the other hand, a rejection would also have serious consequences for the United States. Recently, the U.S. Administration has definitely been making great efforts to alter the impression, formed since the start of the 1980's, of its policy as being one aimed at increasing tension and accelerating the arms race, as a policy which is reviving "the cold war" in the most dangerous form. It follows from this that the people in Washington have understood how great the damage is that can be caused as a result of such a conception of U.S. policy. It must be said that the efforts of the U.S. Administration have produced certain fruits, particularly resulting from the Geneva summit meeting. Quite a few people have begun to hope that the present U.S. Administration will seriously take up the most dangerous of all contemporary international problems -- the limitation and reduction of arms and halting the arms race. If the administration now rejects the nuclear test moratorium proposed by the USSR and then, the negotiations to work out an agreement on a complete nuclear test ban, I think this will convince world public opinion, as well as many Americans, that their hopes did not have any foundation and that the conversations about love of peace and disarmament were merely a maneuver in order to conceal the actual essence of the U.S. policy aimed at intensifying military preparations.

[Ibruk] But the U.S. Administration has rejected many Soviet proposals connected with halting the arms race. Why do you consider that precisely the rejection of the moratorium proposal may lead to such serious changes in the opinion of the world and the U.S. public concerning the policy of the present Washington administration?

[Arbatov] First, because it is clear, not only to the specialists, but also to the public at large, what great significance the proposed step to halt nuclear tests -- a step both simple and, at the same time, effective, -- might have. It is clear to everyone that in order for a new weapon to be developed, it must be tested. If there are no tests, there are no new weapons either. In other words, the halt of nuclear tests means a halt in the nuclear arms race in the most dangerous, the qualitative, field. Second, with regard to this problem, more than with any other, it is clear that there exist no serious reasons or motives whatsoever for a rejection of the Soviet proposal. Such a rejection may only be explained by one thing, by the fact that the United States wants to continue the arms race and all its assurances to the contrary are lies.

[Ibruk] But certain arguments are nevertheless being presented. Could you examine them in more detail?

[Arbatov] At the beginning, as a justification of its rejection of the moratorium, the White House asserted that this year the USSR completed, at an accelerated rate, more nuclear explosions than the United States and then declared a moratorium, calling upon the United States to follow it, in order to prevent the series of tests planned by the United States. All this was a fallacy from the very start. But now, when the United States has carried out a series of five nuclear explosions and overall, has completed considerably more tests both this year and in general, no one could believe the quoted version any more. Then the United States put up another "argument:" Since the halt of nuclear tests cannot be monitored and since the United States does not trust the Soviet Union, the United States cannot agree to a moratorium. Among other things, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz also spoke on this subject in his interview on the eve of the Geneva meeting. However, this "argument" also proves not to hold water. First, because modern national technical apparatus is capable of detecting practically any nuclear explosion, even one of extremely low power. Second, because the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to agree to any other forms and methods of monitoring the nuclear test ban, both national and international.

In this connection, the United States has attempted to change the issue, by sending an invitation to inspectors of the other country to attend its own tests. But this move has fooled no one either. Public opinion, on very sound grounds, sees this proposal not as a measure for limiting the arms race, but as an attempt to gain a form of "blessing" for continuing the tests, to give the tests a "dignified character" and "correctness." In essence, what can such an inspector establish on the spot? The strength of the explosion? But why? Today low-power explosions can be much more dangerous than big ones and the miniaturization of nuclear weapons is connected with the development of first-strike weapons.

In short, the United States has no convincing serious arguments against the nuclear test moratorium. If the rejection of the Soviet proposal indeed proves to be the last word of the current administration, then it will show up its policy in a most unattractive form.

[Ibruk] How do you assess the attitude of world public opinion to this question?

[Arbatov] As extremely united. The nuclear test ban occupies a prominent place in the demands of all those who wish peace to be strengthened and the arms race diminished. I will cite only the recent declaration of the leaders of six states -- India, Mexico, Argentina, Sweden, Greece, and Tanzania -- and also the appeal of the inter-

national "doctors of the world for preventing nuclear war" movement, which was recently awarded the Nobel peace prize. These are only two of many examples. It may be said without exaggeration that the halting of nuclear tests is one of the most popular demands of world public opinion. In this lies the source of the exceptional vital force of the Soviet proposal and also in the fact that it is fair to limit both the United States and the USSR to the same degree, without putting either of the countries in a more difficult situation.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the struggle to halt nuclear tests is ever increasing and I hope that it will be successful. Such a measure would become a historic landmark in the efforts to avert the nuclear threat hanging over mankind.

/12858
CSO: 5200/1221

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW CITES INTERNATIONAL CALLS TO U.S. TO AGREE TO TEST BAN

'Still Enough Time'

LD251927 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMt 25 Dec 85

[From "the World Today" program presented by Boris Kalyagin]

[Text] The international public is insistently demanding that the United States follow the Soviet Union's example and agree to a nuclear weapons test moratorium. Less than a week now remains prior to the expiry of the period during which the USSR's unilateral moratorium remains in force. However, that is still enough time for Washington to join in the Soviet peace initiative. When he returned from Geneva following the Soviet-American summit meeting, U.S. President Reagan declared that specific actions are needed to reinforce the results of the dialogue which had taken place.

But, things are not going beyond words on his side for the time being. The most urgent and specific action right now is precisely a total ban on nuclear explosions, although cessation of these tests will not in themselves mean a reduction of the stockpiled nuclear missile weapons. However, this measure will put up a stable shield in the way of further improving nuclear weapons, will lead to them becoming morally obsolete, and will create a favorable climate for a transition to genuine disarmament. This is stated in many calls by political and public organizations which are sending their messages to the head of the White House.

Thus, the Center for Defense Information, an authorative Washington research organization, in its letter to President Reagan recalls that the Soviet Union is prepared to prolong the moratorium, which expires on 1 January 1986, in the event that the United States also joins in. Cessation of nuclear tests, the letter states, will help prevent the appearance of new, even more highly improved types of nuclear weapons, which will correspond to both countries' security. The French peace movement's National Council also sent a message to President Reagan. Calling on the head of the American Administration to join in the Soviet initiative and proclaim a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests, the French peace supporters underline that such a decision will facilitate the successful holding of negotiations aimed at totally banning nuclear explosions.

UN Delegates Cited

LD210037 Moscow TASS in English 2318 GMT 20 Dec 85

[Text] New York, 21 Dec (TASS)--TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Chernyshev reports:

The international community regards the task of undelayed termination and prohibition of nuclear tests as the call of time. That was most obviously demonstrated by the 40th session of the UN General Assembly, which passed three resolutions, on the initiative of socialist, non-aligned and neutral states, calling for headway, at long last, in the question of termination of nuclear explosions. The United Nations backed up the USSR's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions, the proposal on stopping nuclear tests for 12 months, which was made in the joint message of the heads of state and government of six countries, and called upon all nuclear states to join the moratorium.

As is noted with well-founded disappointment by representatives of different states, three Western nuclear powers--USA, Britain and France--were against the resolutions. They exerted every effort but were unable to find arguments to justify their obstructionist stand.

"Since 1945 the world has witnessed approximately 1,500 nuclear tests, exactly 1,500 more than needed. The need of concluding a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests that would lay the foundation for efforts in the sphere of disarmament is becoming more and more imperative", said Austria's permanent representative at the United Nations Karl Fischer.

"One great power responded to the general call for conclusion of a treaty on universal prohibition of nuclear tests with a moratorium, which began on the 40th anniversary of the bombing of Hiroshima and which is to end on 1 January, 1986, whereas another great power proposed that experts should be present at the holding of a nuclear test."

Representatives of the international community note with concern that behind subterfuges of the United States which is making efforts to avoid joining the moratorium, are ominous plans of escalating nuclear preparations. "Though the number of tests has undoubtedly reduced owing to the Soviet Union's moratorium, the USA continues the tests at a previous rate, and the situation has possibly become even more disquieting", said Mexico's representative Garcia Roblez.

"The United States which in the 1970s made about 12 underground explosions a year on the Nevada test range, increased their number approximately to 16 a year under the Reagan administration."

Indonesia's representative Nana Sutresna has described continuation of nuclear tests as "insane striving for self-destruction". Before conclusion of the treaty on comprehensive prohibition of nuclear tests, he stressed,

all the states should sincerely display devotion to turning back the nuclear arms race and agree to immediate moratorium on nuclear explosions.

Brazil's permanent representative at the United Nations George Maciel has described the U.S. refusal to join the moratorium as "a dangerous and undesirable destabilizing factor." Such a stand, he stressed, "is obviously incompatible with the spirit and the letter of the obligations that were undertaken at least under two international treaties, and might even more heighten the present crisis of confidence in the sphere of disarmament and international security".

"We, small countries, say: 'Heed the opinion of the scientists! Give up the idea of stockpiling nuclear weapons!' The General Assemblys' voice on that question should enforce an end to development of weapons which must never be used", said the delegate of Cyprus Zenon Rossides.

The U.S. stand, which is contrary to the interests of the whole of mankind, has been denounced even by representatives of countries which are Washington's allies. "The treaty on comprehensive prohibition of tests which will be the first major step towards the goal of universal and complete disarmament is quite feasible", said, for instance, Pakistan's permanent representative at the United Nations Shah Navaz. "Pakistan welcomes the Soviet Union's decision on unilateral moratorium and urges other nuclear states to join it as the first step towards concluding a comprehensive test ban treaty".

U.S. Groups Cited

LD272241 Moscow TASS in English 2146 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Text] New York, 27 Dec (TASS)--The U.S. Peace Council has urged the U.S. Administration to stop nuclear tests. The council's message sent to the White House and Congress today emphasizes an urgent necessity to show political realism and to support the initiative of the Soviet Union which has unilaterally introduced a moratorium on any nuclear explosions. The message points out the topicality of the USSR's peace initiative which in the conditions the present-day tense international situation may create favorable conditions for each agreement on a total ban on nuclear weapon testing and ultimately on complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

The message urges the Congress to support the bill which has been submitted to it for consideration and which annuls appropriations necessary for the conduct of nuclear tests.

Bishops of the United Methodist Church of the United States have come out in support of an immediate ban on nuclear tests. In a draft annual pastoral message the nuclear arms race is described as "immoral". The opinion of the religious figures is that the "nuclear deterrent" policy which is advocated by Washington is a dogma aimed at maintaining hostility in the world. The draft message also points out that a ban on nuclear tests will make the process of creating new types of nuclear weapons much more difficult and will subsequently stop it. Thereby one of the main channels of the arms race will be cut off.

U.S. Officials Cited

LD241836 Moscow TASS in English 1809 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 24 Dec (TASS)--TASS political news analyst Igor Orlov writes:

The only thing that is needed to make a Soviet-U.S. moratorium on any nuclear explosions reality is a political will to advance toward taking concrete measures to curtail the arms race and remove war danger. Prominent statesmen and public figures of many countries, including the United States, note that such a will is lacking in Washington so far and urge it to show this will till it is not too late. A few days remain for joining in the moratorium and sealing it forever for both sides. Why not do so? Gerald Evans asks this in the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT. Similar questions are put by many public figures in the USA.

Most prominent physicist Glenn Seaborg is providing that the United States' joining in the moratorium would promote the curbing of the arms race and the consolidation of the confidence of the sides. Many U.S. congressmen go along with him. The Soviet initiative opens a historic opportunity, Congressman Edward Markey said. He emphasized the need of using that opportunity.

How wide the attitudes in favor of such an action are in the U.S. can now be seen from the fact that 46 U.S. senators and 106 congressmen made a call to the President the other day to resume talks on the ban on nuclear tests, regarding such talks as an excellent way of developing the atmosphere of cooperation that has formed after the Geneva meeting.

Going by everything, such a course, however, does not suit those circles in the U.S. that link themselves with the militaristic policy and the interests of the military-industrial complex, those who have no wish to abandon the planned programs of the development of new kinds of nuclear arms. Hence the artificially created reasoning which quite often runs counter to logic and generally known facts. It is alleged, for instance, that the USSR is ahead of the U.S. in the development and modernization of nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, it is known that since 1945 the United States staged more nuclear explosions than all the rest of the nuclear countries taken together, and that the number of the U.S. nuclear explosions is larger by at least one third than those made by the USSR.

Standard references to the "problem of control" hold no water, either. As the WASHINGTON POST justly notes, those references have been constantly made by those who protest any bans on nuclear weapon tests whatsoever. The absurdity of the references to the problem of control has become even more obvious after the Soviet Union declared in favor of coming to terms with the USA also on some measuresof on-site verification for removing possible doubts about the observance of a moratorium, if a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions is established now. The Soviet Union's stand, as

NEWSWEEK aptly put it, "undercut the handiest rationale the Reagan Administration had for rejecting" a moratorium. The magazine writes that the Soviet Union can now tell the world that America resists a test ban because it wants to develop new kinds of nuclear weapons. It should be added that ever more authoritative American politicians and specialists arrive at the same conclusion. They insistently urge the U.S. Administration to realize the seriousness of the situation and not to miss a real chance to halt and reverse the dangerous nuclear arms race.

SED's Jarowinskiy Lauds USSR

LD231111 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Berlin, 23 Dec (TASS)--The Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) and all working people of the GDR view the Soviet Unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions as a proof of the USSR's consistent and peaceful policy, said Werner Jarowinskiy, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the SED Central Committee. The enormous interest, aroused in the world by the Soviet Union's major initiative--he told TASS correspondent Yuriy Borisov in an interview--shows how close these proposals are to the aspirations of the peoples. The USSR agrees to far-going verification measures, which means that this question cannot be considered as a hitch in achieving the Soviet-American agreement on mutual moratorium.

The world public expects, Werner Jarowinsky said, the American Administration to show constructive approach towards the question of moratorium and readiness towards talks on complete termination of nuclear explosions. The ball is in Washington's court.

"The USSR's decision on unilateral moratorium met with broad response in our country. It encourages us to make fresh efforts in the struggle for improving international situation," Werner Jarowinskiy said.

GDR Dismisses Monitoring Objections

LD271412 Moscow TASS in English 1257 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Text] Berlin, 27 Dec (TASS)--The Soviet Union's latest initiative, a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, has served further proof of its firm commitment to peace and its constructive and principle stand on a vital issue for all mankind, that of averting nuclear war, said Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer of the German Democratic Republic.

Speaking in an interview with TASS correspondent Yuriy Borisov, he noted that the Soviet moratorium has been announced till 1 January, 1986, but can be extended beyond that date if it is joined by the United States.

The major Soviet initiative has met with full support and approval in the GDR, just as elsewhere in the world. A joint Soviet-U.S. moratorium on all nuclear blasts would be an important step to eliminating the nuclear threat.

By making this initiative, Fischer said, the Soviet Union has sought to check the development of new and upgrading of existing kinds of weapons. This means that the Soviet move is directed at terminating the nuclear arms race. The Soviet proposal provides for adequate verification arrangements. This is why all those opposing the moratorium, pleading difficulties with monitoring it and rejecting the Soviet proposal under this far-fetched pretext, simply do not want disarmament.

The GDR fully supports demands by the peace-minded public that the Soviet proposal be accepted. This would confirm in practice, Fischer said, that the accords resulting from the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva are being followed up with practical actions.

FRG SDP Disarmament Expert

LD302335 Moscow TASS in English 2037 GMT 30 Dec 85

["U.S. Nuclear Tests Denounced"--TASS headline]

[Text] Bonn, 30 Dec (TASS)--A new underground test of a nuclear device staged by the U.S. in Nevada has been denounced at the West Germany Bundestag by Hermann Scheer, expert of the Social Democratic parliamentary group on disarmament problems.

The nuclear test staged by the U.S., the next in turn, shows that the U.S. Administration does not even think of a central and complete ban on nuclear explosions, the prominent member of the Social Democratic Party of Germany stressed.

PRAVDA Cites Hungarian Support

PM231249 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Session Completed Work"]

[Text] Budapest, 22 Dec--A routine session of the Hungarian National Assembly has ended here. J. Kadar, general secretary of the MSZMP Central Committee, and other party and state leaders took part in its work.

Hungarian Foreign Minister P. Varkonyi, who addressed the session, stated that Hungary fully supports the Soviet Union's proposals aimed at improving the international situation and normalizing Soviet-U.S. relations. The implementation of these initiatives, he said, meets the fundamental interests of all peoples of the world, including the Hungarian people.

The minister said that the Soviet side's unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions and the Soviet suggestion that the United States follow its example were a vivid manifestation of the USSR's sincere desire to strengthen peace and develop international cooperation.

The Hungarian National Assembly deputies adopted the law on the Seventh 5-Year Plan for the country's national economic development and the 1986 state budget and approved a number of other draft laws.

SRV Ministers View U.S. Rejection

PM031240 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 1 Jan 86 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "According With the Peoples' Aspirations" -- uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Text] Hanoi, 31 Dec -- The unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions introduced by the Soviet Union and other Soviet initiatives in this sphere are expanding the real opportunities for ending all types of nuclear explosions and for gradually stopping the arms race, SRV Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee Politburo, stated.

THE USSR'S PROPOSALS, he stated in an interview with a TASS correspondent, FULLY ACCORD WITH THE VITAL ASPIRATIONS OF THE PEOPLES OF THE ENTIRE WORLD. Unfortunately, the good-will step taken by the Soviet Union has not yet produced the proper response in the United States. The Soviet Union's important initiative, the head of the SRV's foreign policy department stressed, is aimed at removing the threat of nuclear catastrophe hanging over the world's peoples. By rejecting the USSR's proposals the United States is committing a crime against mankind. In the new year, which has been declared peace year, we must step up the struggle to ensure the total prohibition of all types of nuclear explosions.

THE NEW NUCLEAR EXPLOSION HELD AT A NEVADA TEST SITE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE SDI PROGRAM IS EVIDENCE OF THE U.S. ADMINISTRATION'S IRRESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO THE MOST IMPORTANT INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS OF THE DAY, Van Tien Dung, member of the CPV Central Committee Politburo and SRV minister of national defense, stated.

The fact that the United States rejects the USSR's proposals on a moratorium and continues to carry out nuclear explosions necessitates increased vigilance from the peoples and an intensification of their struggle against U.S. imperialism's dangerous plans, Van Tien Dung stressed.

Latin American Human Rights Group

LD261942 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT 26 Dec 85

[Text] Quito, 26 Dec (TASS)--The Latin American Human Rights Association sent an appeal to the Government of the United States, the governments of Latin American countries, the United Nations Organization, the Organization of American States. The appeal points to the importance for humanity's

destinies of the Soviet Union's initiative for the establishment of a moratorium on nuclear testing. The appeal urges the U.S. Administration to join in the Soviet initiative and thus to show the readiness to preserve everything possible that has been achieved at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

If the United States joined in the Soviet Union's decision to establish a moratorium on nuclear testing, this would be a concrete step towards achieving genuine detente and curbing the arms race. Moreover, this would become an important recognition for the right of peoples to live in conditions of peace and struggle actively for it, says the appeal.

The continuation of underground nuclear tests by the United States not only promotes the continuation of the arms race but also threatens the ecological balance on the globe, provokes climatic changes and, undoubtedly, is one of the reasons why seismic activity became more frequent in the Western hemisphere of late, the association's appeal says.

Indonesian Foreign Minister Cited

LD271842 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 27 Dec 85

[Text] Jakarta, 27 Dec (TASS)--Indonesia, just like the entire world, is waiting for a U.S. positive reply to the Soviet initiative concerning a ban on any nuclear explosions, stated Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, Indonesian minister of foreign affairs. A ban on nuclear explosions, he said in answer to a question put by TASS correspondent Valeriy Fedortsov, is a concrete step on the way towards the establishment of lasting peace on earth.

The struggle for peace is one of the key directions of the international policy of Indonesia which champions a free and active foreign-policy course. Indonesia as a member of the Non-aligned Movement has authored a proposal on declaring South East Asia a zone free from nuclear weapons. The more nuclear-free zones on earth, the less room will remain for a nuclear conflict, and the stronger peace throughout the world will be, the minister emphasized.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: UK PAPER ATTEMPTS TO JUSTIFY U.S. REJECTION OF MORATORIUM

LD240950 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 24 Dec 85

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] The British newspaper THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH has published an article in which it tried to prove how unacceptable is the Soviet proposal for a moratorium on nuclear weapons tests. The newspaper bases its viewpoint on the fact that continuation of the tests is essential for the creation of new British missiles and for the American star wars progarm. Viktor Levin is at the microphone:

The moratorium on all nuclear explosions, introduced by the Soviet Union on 6 August, made a deep impression upon the world public. The peoples of the world has good grounds for seeing this initiative by the Soviet Union as a real step forward along the path of curbing the nuclear arms race, along the path of ending nuclear weapons tests.

Reports about support for the Soviet position are coming in literally from all countries and from all continents. At the same time calls upon the U.S. Administration to join the Soviet Union and to follow its noble example are mounting. Having found itself in a hardly pleasant atmosphere of growing international isolation, the U.S. Administration is trying in every way to justify its position of refusing to introduce a moratorium on holding nuclear explosions. For a long time the United States speculated on the problem of monitoring the implementation of a moratorium of that kind, but the Soviet Union demonstrated the whole far-fetched nature of these assertions, having confirmed that it is willing to agree to international monitoring.

In this complicated situation for the United States, the British THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH, with zeal beyond all reason set out its opinion of justifications for rejection of the moratorium. Let me recall how THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH explains its position. Britain, the newspaper reports, needs nuclear weapons tests for the development of warheads for the new Trident-II missiles. And the United States, THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH sobs in sympathy, will not be able to develop its space strike weapons. In no way can one give up nuclear weapons tests, THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH says.

In my view the British newspaper deserves a thank you for setting out so frankly the real reasons for the unwillingness of the United States and Britain to join in the Soviet moratorium. They don't talk like that in the U.S. State Department. But it is difficult to say if the diplomats will be pleased with what THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH published, for the newspaper has done them an ill-service. It could not be otherwise, for it is impossible to back up a policy which is hostile to the cause of peace and the interests of the peoples, with any arguments that are convincing and weighty.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: 'HOSTILE RECEPTION' GIVEN TO CONGRESS SDI TEST BAN

LD301753 Moscow TASS in English 1742 GMT 30 Dec 85

["The Pentagon Determined To Push Its Way Through" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 30 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Bogachev:

The United States Congress has decided not to allow the holding of tests of U.S. anti-satellite weapons in the current fiscal year (till October 1986).

This decision of the U.S. Congress caught the attention of observers above all for the reason that its implementation could become an initial practical step of the USA toward implementing tasks formulated during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva -- the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth. And the ending of anti-satellite weapon tests by the United States, following the Soviet Union, could create a precedent for other measures facilitating the achievement of mutually acceptable agreements between the two great powers.

There exist in the world now real preconditions for an effective solution of the question of anti-satellite weapons. The Soviet Union has pledged itself never to be the first to put weapons into space. The Soviet Union is prepared for a radical solution of the question of anti-satellite weapons -- to agree on the renunciation of tests of any of such systems, on the banning of the creation of new and on the elimination of the existing anti-satellite weapon systems of the sides, and on banning tests and use of manned spaceships for military ends, including anti-satellite purposes.

Approval by the U.S. Administration of the decision of the Congress on temporary halting of tests of anti-satellite weapons would be a precedent in itself. This would be the first case in the past five years of the Pentagon's giving up tests of U.S. weapons not for "technical reasons" but out of the wish to show Washington's good will. As is known, the White House has so far been asserting that testing of U.S. weapons is part of the United States "honest efforts" to achieve agreement with the USSR on their ban.

Deplorably, reports show that the U.S. Administration gave a hostile reception also to the latest decision of the Congress.

Refusal of the Congress to appropriate funds for the further testing of anti-satellite weapons systems is viewed in the White House as a "blow at the President," A spokesman for the Pentagon told an observer of THE WASHINGTON POST that the Pentagon will find the way to get ahead, that is, to continue tests of those space strike systems.

The reputation of the present administration as a partner in the talks would undoubtedly be enhanced if the White House abandoned the absurd thesis: "To the ban of weapon tests through their continuation by the United States." The advance of international relations along the road charted in Geneva in November would also be facilitated.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

U.S. MAGAZINE CITED BY MOSCOW ON MORATORIUM ISSUE

FM271117 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under the rubric "From the Pages of the Foreign Press": "About the Moratorium on Nuclear Explosions"]

[Text] With regard to the Soviet readiness -- given the establishment of a mutual moratorium now -- to reach agreement with the United States also on certain on-site monitoring measures to remove possible doubts about compliance with such a moratorium, the U.S. weekly NEWSWEEK writes: "The USSR's readiness has undercut the handiest rationale to which the Reagan administration resorted in refusing to subscribe to the moratorium declared by the USSR. The Soviet Union can now tell the whole world that the United States refuses to undertake to ban nuclear tests because it wants to develop new kinds of nuclear arms."

"It is perfectly obvious that a test ban would run counter to the administration's adherence to the 'Strategic Defense Initiative' and, particularly, to one constituent part of it known as "Project Excalibur." The President has described SDI as a plan aimed at making nuclear arms obsolete. But "Project Excalibur," which is being developed by scientists at the Livermore National Laboratory, is based on a thermonuclear explosion and envisions the creation of a nuclear-powered x-ray laser. It will not be possible to create such a laser without nuclear explosions like the test code-named 'Goldstone', which was postponed last week."

Even before the Soviet Union expressed its readiness concerning verification of the compliance with the moratorium, many U.S. specialists were voicing the conviction that modern seismic sensors are capable of pinpointing any serious violation of such a moratorium, the magazine writes. As the House Foreign Affairs Committee declared this year, "It is policy and not technology that has prevented us from concluding a total nuclear test ban treaty."

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS OBSERVER ON PEACE YEAR, MORATORIUM

LD311816 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1251 GMT 31 Dec 85

["January--First Day of International Peace Year"--TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 31 Dec (TASS) -- TASS observer Valentin Vasilets writes:

By decision of the UN General Assembly, the new year has been declared International Peace Year, which ought to serve as yet another stimulus for all states to make their actions commensurate with the requirements of tackling the chief task of today -- that of strengthening the security of peoples and eliminating the threat of war, nuclear war first and foremost.

Naturally, the closest attention will be given, as before, to the two mightiest powers, upon whose actions universal peace depends to no small degree. However, one has to state once again with some concern, that it is hardly possible to find much in common in their approaches to the basic aim of the international year -- consolidation of security on the planet. It is justifiable to say that up until now, only one of these two powers has been guided in its actions by these concerns -- the Soviet Union. In fact, let us take just one example, the moratorium on any nuclear explosions declared unilaterally by the Soviet Union from 6 August. For even U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and those of his ilk who -- like the hero of the famous Stanley Kubrick film "Dr Strangelove" -- have "learned to love the atom bomb" and to hate its enemies, are unable to find arguments in order to ascribe selfish, egoistic motives to the Soviet Union, which has made an attempt to slow down the nuclear arms race.

The United States has been equally unsuccessful in trying to make any argument at all presentable to justify its refusal to heed Moscow's call and reject nuclear explosions. Because there is only one sole rational explanation for the U.S. rejection: the desire to continue stockpiling nuclear arsenals to achieve military-strategic superiority. And not just to stockpile them, but to give them qualitatively new, space-based features.

The latest nuclear test in Nevada was an event of rare significance. The echo of the explosion buried the hopes of those who expected that the United States would join with the Soviet moratorium, which expires on 31 December, at the last moment. That is the first thing. Second, the Pentagon, with cynical demonstrativeness, chose for the explosion a moment when the wave of expectations and hopes had risen particularly

high on the eve of the expiry of the Soviet moratorium. This was a calculated blow against universal hopes to make 1986 the year mankind begins to live without nuclear tests. Third, the falsehood of Washington's assurances that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" has nothing to do with nuclear weapons has been laid totally bare: the explosion in the Nevada desert was directly connected with testing one of the elements of SDI, an X-ray laser.

In his message on the occasion of the International Peace Week beginning on 1 January, UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar stated: The need to restrict and, in the final analysis, halt the arms race has never been so acute.

One cannot fail to agree with this statement, since the transfer of the arms race to near-earth orbit threatens the loss of any control over this process. The decision of the U. General Assembly to stage an International Peace Year is all the more timely: the need to mobilize all forces of the world in order to halt the nuclear arms race and to save our earth, has never before been so urgent.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1229

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S KUZNETSOV CALLS FOR ENDING NUCLEAR TESTS

PM091600 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 1, Jan 86 pp 6-8

[Vladlen Kuznetsov article: "Will Nuclear Testing Cease?"]

[Text] The nuclear age began with the first test of the deadliest weapon ever (if we discount the theoretical and laboratory stages of its development). The test was carried out by Washington in Alamogordo, New Mexico, on 16 July 1945. Within weeks on 6 August, the Americans tried out their A-bomb in action--on Hiroshima.

Nuclear tests do not necessarily lead to war. In the forty years since the bomb was dropped there have been no more Hiroshimas. There is no guarantee, however, that things will remain so forever. The overproduction of nuclear weapons is fraught with the threat of a holocaust. Nuclear war could break out by accident.

Tests are not carried out for testing's sake. They give the green light to improved and new-generation weapons. These weapons are tested for combat use. Test race breeds arms race, demanding ever newer experiments. How is this vicious circle to be broken?

By stopping the tests, comes the answer. No tests would mean no confidence in the efficiency of this or that weapon system and, consequently, no stimulus to produce it. And if production lines slow down, there will be fewer weapons to deploy, the arms race will lose its momentum, and the threat of war will diminish. Consequently, the stopping of weapon tests will directly affect subsequent processes connected with the production of weapons. There is a further point which certainly merits more attention than it is getting at present. If it becomes impossible to test newly invented weapons or those on the drawing boards, then research and development will make no sense at all, and the processes leading to the improvement of old weapons and the creation of new ones will then be as good as blocked.

This could be the result of stopping nuclear tests.

To end nuclear blasts would effectively mean to take a resolute step towards restricting, materially and physically, the practical possibilities for producing new-type nuclear warheads, bombs and missiles. A step which, under present circumstances, would probably be easier to agree upon than other far-reaching measures.

Seeking to reduce the threat of nuclear war, curb the arms race and consolidate and promote the progress made at the Geneva summit, the Soviet Union is now insisting on the complete banning of nuclear weapon tests for an unlimited period of time under effective international control.

Receiving Professor Bernard Lown, co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, in the Kremlin on December 18, Mikhail Gorbachev voiced the Soviet Union's readiness to extend beyond January 1, 1986, the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing announced by the Soviet Union on August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of Hiroshima -- if Washington followed suit. Moscow has offered humanity a truly historic and unique opportunity to make nuclear disarmament a reality, create a reliable guarantee of preventing a global catastrophe. "It would be unreasonable, to say the least, to miss this chance which paves the way for an agreement on banning all nuclear tests for all time," the Soviet leader stressed. "Now it rests with the Government of the U.S. to decide the matter."

The civilized world wishes to see the issue satisfactorily resolved.

The UN General Assembly has just adopted a resolution on the immediate stopping and banning of all nuclear weapon tests, with only three member states -- the U.S., Britain and France -- voting against it.

"We must remember the farsightedness which led us to such achievements as the treaty on the partial banning of nuclear weapon tests signed over 20 years ago," Perez de Cuellar, the UN secretary-general, said in his report on the Organization's work in 1985. "Today the reaching of an agreement on the comprehensive banning of nuclear tests would be clear and extremely important evidence of mankind's preparedness to remove the nuclear threat."

The leaders of six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden -- called upon the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. last October to stop nuclear tests altogether and usher in an era of peace and security for all mankind.

"The halting of all nuclear explosions and the concluding of a nuclear test ban treaty are priority demands of world public opinion and of the United Nations," says the statement of the World Peace Council published on July 31, 1985.

What is the nature of public feeling in the United States in this respect? The leaders of 150 peace organizations have called on the President to follow the Soviet example, describing it as "the most promising arms control development of recent years." In May 1985, the House Foreign Affairs Committee called on the administration to resume negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for the purpose of reaching an agreement on the complete banning of nuclear tests, and to submit the 1974 and 1976 Soviet-American treaties on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes for ratification. Forty-six senators and 106 representatives urged the administration to resume talks on banning nuclear tests and described these talks as a fine way of promoting the atmosphere of cooperation which has set in after the Geneva summit.

Addressing a special arms control group of the House Armed Services Committee, William Colby, ex-director of the CIA, characterized the Soviet peace initiatives as "very substantial offers in recent months indicating a desire for a mutual ending of the arms race which is, of course, very much in their (the Russians') interest as it is in ours." William Colby believes that the best way to put an end to the arms race is simply to stop it, and he is not alone in thinking so.

It is unnessary to conduct a public opinion poll to find out what sane people the world over want -- their desires are clear. There do exist, nevertheless, individuals whose views on certain matters of principle are at variance -- to put it mildly -- with common sense and normal logic, which does not prevent them from dressing up even absurdities as pearls of wisdom beyond the reach of the "uninitiated."

Seeking to discredit the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests in the eyes of international (and American) public opinion, such experts in political chicanery assert that the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests has cost Moscow nothing because the latter has brought its own test programme to a successful conclusion and is now working to prevent the Americans completing theirs, and this at a time when the United States is already finding it difficult to keep abreast of them.

Actually, it is the Soviet Union that has to keep abreast of the U.S. in all aspects of the arms race, nuclear weapon tests included. Judging from estimates of experts and competent organizations the number of nuclear tests the U.S. has carried out since 1945 is 30 percent in excess of the Soviet figure. According to the U.S. Centre for Defence Information, the U.S. certainly leads the world in this respect. So who leads the race?

Since Moscow's suspension of nuclear tests, Weashington has already carried out six. Altogether, allocations to underground nuclear tests have doubled during Reagan's presidency. Three billion dollars have been earmarked for the extension of existing nuclear weapon proving grounds and building new ones in the next few years. In May 1955, it will be recalled, the Soviet Union submitted to the UN Disarmament Commission a proposal that all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons should pledge themselves to stop nuclear tests. This was done despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. had carried out fewer tests than the U.S. As for the current, unilateral moratorium, Moscow cut short its test programme, without its being completed. Deciding on such a move was no easy matter, considering the scale of war preparations the U.S. and NATO in general are now engaged in. The decision shows that Moscow is guided by political considerations of principle, and concern for the future of the war-threatened world, rather than by mere arithmetric. If official Washington follows the Soviet leaders' actions with due attention it cannot fail to note that they are taking a truly innovatory and bold approach to problems of international security and are prepared to adopt far-reaching measures, unilateral ones included, to the point of self-restriction, in order to get the process of arms limitation and reduction off the ground and bring to reason those who, with the nuclear abyss yawning at their feet, are still trying to delude themselves and others with false hopes that the world's salvation lies in the "balance of fear."

Placards reading "Russia stopped testing. Why don't we?" can be seen in front of the White House today. Why, indeed? Asked when the U.S. would be able to stop nulcear tests, the President answered that he had no idea.

What they do have an idea of is why they are reluctant to stop nuclear weapon tests.

The Pentagon is planning to improve the warheads of MX, Trident, Midgetman and cruise missiles. Designers are busy developing third-generation weapons "able to focus the awesome destructive force of nuclear weapons more selectively." In the Pentagon they believe that the new miracle weapons "could be the most significant change in nuclear weapons technology since the early days of the nuclear era." Such a temptation is too strong to resist.

The arms race is being given an entirely new dimension. Competely new weapons are being developed with which to fight a nuclear war. This is all but taken for granted. "Without such research and testing," THE NEW YORK TIMES says, "there would be little confidence that the complex system of command and control would permit what Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger has called a protracted nuclear war in which the United States could prevail."

Nuclear Shylocks are overstocked but they cannot be satiated. They say that continued testing is vital to U.S. national security, "indispensable to maintaining the credibility of our nuclear deterrent," to quote Richard Perle, Weinberger's assistant and an out-and-out hawk.

U.S. "deterrent" potential is considered inadequate, we are told. One can't help marvelling at the nerve of those who claim this. Isn't it common knowledge that the U.S. has stockpiled enough nuclear weapons to blow the world skyhigh ten times over? "Surely the Soviets know, as well as we do," Harold Evans writes in the article "The President's Chance" carried by U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, "that even without further testing we have for the next 100 years enough reliable warheads to destroy their society ten times over." Knowing this is not enough. It's about time conclusions were drawn from the knowledge of harsh realities, and this knowledge translated into practical policy using the chance offered by the other side in order to guarantee, by joint effort, mutual survival rather than mutual destruction.

Both the Americans and their European allies are trying hard to convince the White House that it would be only plain common sense to take the hand extended by the Soviet Union, to make its unilateral moratorium bilateral and ultimately, universal. "If we never built, nor tested another nuclear weapon," the Centre of Defence Information explained to the President, "we would retain the clear and certain capability to annihilate the Soviet Union well into the 21st century. If that certainty will not deter a Soviet attack on the U.S. nothing will." That's true enough. Even if American weapons lose somewhat in efficiency and reliability with time, the CDI goes on, the same will be true of Soviet arms as well. In what way will mutual deterrence weaken if both sides submit to the same process?

This process of mutual restraint and curtailing preparations for war does not suit those who set the tone of all American state policy, the captains of the American military-industrial complex. This explains why the other side does not listen to reason.

At his point it is opportune to mention the principal reason for which Washington rejects the chance to stop rivalry in the development and testing of nuclear warheads and the means of their delivery. This is to be found in SDI, the "star wars" programme, a programme which, though publicized as a non-nuclear one, requires, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, the nuclear testing of an X-ray laser which is amongst its components. Edward Teller, "the father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb," is one of those who are pushing SDI the hardest. This fanatic to whom nothing seems sacred except arms is said to have talked the President into increasing allocations to a whole series of tests to be carried out in the context of the SDI programme.

Seeking to conceal the sinister purposes of experiments with nuclear arms and explain its refusal to stop them, the U.S. Administration talks about the "inadequacy" of control. This is referred to as almost the main obstacle in the way of an agreement on a mutual moratorium. This obstacle, however, is of Washington's making.

As early as March 1963, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR gave the lie to the argument that control was impossible. It wrote that the art of detecting nuclear blasts and distinguishing them from earthquakes had reached a point where the U.S. could calmly consent to a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, underground ones included, and rely on its own monitoring facilities. Now, almost a quarter of a century later, this art has been further refined and brought to foolproof reliability. Many experts, American included, are unanimous that if an agreement is reached verifying its observance will be no problem at all. "Is it (the ban) policeable from outside Soviet borders?" the Baltimore SUN asks.

•

"Yes, say respected American seismologists, among them Jack F. Evernden, a research geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey who has worked on nuclear test detection since 1965." He is of the opinion that "the problem today is lack of political will, not technical incompetence."

There are over a thousand seismic stations in the world. Those belonging to the U.S. and its allies are located near Soviet borders. By virtue of their geographical location alone Washington has a much greater verification capability than Moscow. Modern equipment responds to explosions of a yield as low as one kiloton. Such are the indisputable facts.

The problem of a complete and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests is nothing new. It goes back many decades. The international community has accumulated no mean experience in dealing with the problem, and this experience is most instructive.

In 1955 the U.S.S.R. came up with its first proposal to stop testing. The proposal fell on deaf ears.

In 1958 the U.S.S.R. suspended its nuclear weapon tests from March 31, but announced their resumption on August 30, 1961. Certain quarters in Washington are not averse to speculating on this fact of postwar history: How can we trust the Russians, when they go back on their own decisions, they inquire. But the first Soviet moratorium was made conditional on the Western powers following the Soviet example. At first everything seemed to go well. The U.S. joined in on August 22, and Britain immediately afterwards. But as early as December 29, 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower said that the U.S. would consider itself free from its obligations as from December 31. France started nuclear testing in February 1960. What was the Soviet Union to do under the circumstances? Neglect its security?

If Washington fails to listen to reason today and give Moscow's good will its due, the U.S.S.R. will not waive the interests of its own security and that of its allies and friends.

On August 5, 1963, the Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water was signed. The treaty, the signatories to which now number 113, was the first step towards the limitation of the arms race. The temporary moratorium of 1958-61 had certainly contributed to it. Another contributing factor was a unilateral moratorium of atmosphereic tests announced by President Kennedy. Yes, there was a time when the U.S. ventured upon such actions, too. Kennedy set a precedent, and the lack of similar manifestiations of good will is a reproach to the current administration.

In 1974-76, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. signed two treaties, one restricting the yield of underground nuclear explosions to 150 kilotons, and the other setting this limit also for underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Both documents remain unratified, but the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. stick to their commitments.

In 1977-82, the U.S.S.R. , the U.S.A. and Britain entered into negotiations, on the Soviet initiative, with a view to signing a complete and universal nuclear test ban treaty. The document had been agreed upon, on the whole, by the summer of 1980. At that very moment the U.S.A. and NATO backed down. At the concluding stage the talks were cut short by the West. In July 1982, the Reagan administration refused to resume them.

Such is the background to the current Soviet moratorium. Every step along the road to a complete termination of nuclear tests was hard won. Nevertheless, the steps have been taken, which shows that a practical solution is not impossible. And the Soviet Union is now doing all it can to make further headway.

In order to heighten the effectiveness of control that Washington insists upon, the U.S.S.R. has supported the idea of using an international verification system. Six states have offered the use of their territories for monitoring the observance of a treaty on stopping nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. If the moratorium were mutual, the two sides could agree on certain on-the-spot verification measures to remove whatever doubts might arise as to the observance of the obligations assumed.

The world is now waiting for Moscow and Washington to continue the processes initiated at the Geneva summit. Would a mutual moratorium not give weighty confirmation to the "new start" the U.S. President spoke of? Is not such a moratorium aimed at making nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete," which is President Reagan's professed objective?

The nuclear age started with tests. It is high time they were stopped and a new age leading to a nuclear-free world was ushered in.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1229

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR: NUCLEAR TESTS SHOW HARDENING U.S. VIEW

PM231635 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 51, 13 Dec 85 pp 12-13

[Editorial: "Unanswered Questions"]

[Text] Some days ago President Reagan visited a high school in Fallston, Maryland, where he gave something of a summary of the Geneva summit and answered questions asked by the pupils. He said that "the people of both our countries want the same thing: a safer and better future for themselves and their children." Further he said that "a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought," and that "there have to be deeds, both sides, to show that we mean we want to get along."

All these postulates are unquestionable. The only new thing is that in recent weeks the President has been returning to them. Among the questions he was asked was this: "As you said, the Soviet people believe that the Americans are looking for war. What can we, as Americans, do to help change that?"

The President did not answer the question, although, as we know, forthrightness is a must when talking with young people; otherwise there is no point in entering into such an exchange. Instead, he tried to justify distrust of the Russians, resorting, as usual, to crude misrepresentation of what he called the "basic Marxism principle." Where, then, do the "deeds" come in?

The day after the Fallson meeting a new underground nuclear test explosion, the 15th in the U.S. this year, was carried out in Nevada. Can this explosion code-named Hawks Nest, be classified as a deed? Unquestionably. Do such deeds strengthen confidence? Certainly not. It is in place [as published] to dwell on this as the year approaches its end. Ever since August 6, Hiroshima Day, the Soviet Union has of its own free will unilaterally refrained from staging nuclear tests -- to help build confidence and search for ways to arms control. We also undertook the commitment to prolong the moratorium indefinitely after January 1 if the American side followed our example. How about the "better future' and, most important, the deeds leading to it, Mr President?

The Soviet decision was not a propaganda exercise, as Washington has tried to make it appear -- true, unsuccessfully. Termination of testing is a serious matter. All the more so if it is done unilaterally. For if the other side continues test explosions, there is a risk involved. Especially today, when the drive for "super-weapons" has become an obsession in Washington. Hawks Nest, incidentally was the sixth U.S. test since August.

Testing has always been the central element in the military buildup formula of development-testing-stockpiling. Precisely because of this the Soviet Union took its bold step. It did so in the interests of the Soviet and American peoples, for the sake of a better future for all the peoples of the world.

Termination of testing as an effective -- perhaps the most effective -- means of limiting the nuclear arms race has invariably figured on the agenda of various U.N. agencies ever since 1954. Testing has been suspended twice, both times on the initiative of the Soviet Union. Washington has lacked the political will to do likewise. It has habitually invoked the "problem of verification." Today this excuse is patently invalid: according to the testimony of scientists, American scientists included, the problem no longer exists. Yet, THE WASHINGTON POST reports, the U.S. is further hardening its position: "The Reagan Administration will not resume negotiations to halt nuclear weapons testing (these talks were broken off by the U.S. side in 1982 -- ed.) until the superpowers have made deep reductions in their current nuclear stockpiles, according to Pentagon and other officials."

The Washington strategists could hardly have devised a more effective way of obstructing progress. The most important means of limiting armaments is made dependent on the limitations themselves. The purpose -- on this score there can be no two opinions -- is to continue the arms buildup. We do not know whether hawks nest at the Nevada test site. But the Washington hawks are certainly hard at work.

"Where is your courage, Mr President?" David Cortright, executive director of SANE, a U.S. public organization, asked soon after the announcement of the Soviet moratorium on nuclear testing. That question was left unanswered. Like the question asked in Fallston.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR DECRIES 'GOLDSTONE' NUCLEAR BLAST

Disproves White House Assurances

LD300004 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 29 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The United States carried out an underground nuclear explosion on 28 December at the test range in Nevada State. Its capacity was 150 kilotons. The test was carried out in the framework of development [razrabotka] of lasers initiated by nuclear explosions, with the intention of using such devices in star wars. Thus administration assertions to the effect that the Strategic Defense Initiative is a non-nuclear program were completely disproved. The Nevada explosion also is evidence of the fact that despite White House assurances to the effect that the United States is striving to reduce the nuclear threat Washington is stubbornly sticking to a course toward further building up nuclear arsenals on earth and spreading the arms race to space.

As is reported with reference to representatives of the U.S. Department of Energy and the Pentagon by THE NEW YORK TIMES, the main task of the nuclear explosion carried out in the United States yesterday was the testing of an X-ray laser excited by nuclear means, a weapon being developed for the Reagan-proposed antimissile defense system with space-based elements. According to a CNN television company report, this is already the fifth explosion during which X-ray laser technology has been tested. [video shows long shot of test range and circle of blast]

Disproves Non-Nuclear Claims

LD290731 Moscow TASS in English 0711 GMT 29 Dec 85

["The USA Continues Nuclear Explosions"--TASS headline]

[Text] Washington, 29 Dec (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The United States continues nuclear explosions in defiance of the calls by the public and the governments of many countries to join in the Soviet Union's unilaterally announced moratorium on all nuclear explosions until January 1, 1986. The U.S. Department of Energy has announced that an undergound nuclear explosion codenamed "Goldstone" was carried out at the proving ground in Nevada on Saturday.

According to official data, the yield of the explosion was 150 kilotons. The explosion, as the Department of Energy has admitted, was affected within the framework of the tests of nuclear devices which are intended to provide energy for laser weapons which are being developed under the "star wars" program. This fully disproves the administration's assertions that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) is ostensibly a "non-nuclear program." The explosion in Nevada also indicates that, contrary to the assurances of the White House that the United States seeks to lessen the nuclear threat, Washington stubbornly clings to the course which is aimed at further building up nuclear arsenals on earth and at transferring the arms race to outer space.

At the same time the White House continues the campaign to misinform the public in an attempt to reduce the problem of arms control and termination of nuclear tests to inspection and verification matters. It was precisely on the far-fetched plea of the need to work out a machinery for inspection and verification that the administration declined to join in the Soviet moratorium thereby frustrating the real opportunity to prevent already now a spiralling up of the arms race. In this connection the authoritative Centre for Defense Information in Washington has pointed out that the unwillingness of the White House to end nuclear tests is explained not at all by inspection and verification difficulties, for such difficulties simply do not exist with the present level of the development of satellite and seismic global observation network. Besides, the Soviet Union has expressed readiness to go to a mutual improvement of inspection and verification systems including those for on-site inspection. The essence of the mattter is that Washington intends to continue making attempts at achieving military-strategic superiority.

It is not superfluous to recall that the United States Congress has allocated almost 300,000 million dollars for military purposes for the 1986 fiscal year alone, with 16,400 million dollars being planned to be spent for the creation of nuclear arms, for the upgrading of proving grounds, and for other military construction.

'Reckless Practical Deeds'

LD291648 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 29 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 29 TASS -- Vladimir Bogachev, TASS military news analyst, writes:

Thus, after a nine-day delay, the United States conducted in Nevada State on December 28 a new nuclear weapons test code-named "Goldstone".

Those who are fond of statistics pointed out that this underground nuclear explosion has been the 16th in the Nevada proving range among those announced in Washington this year. Political observers have different counts, stressing that "Goldstone" has been the seventh American testing after the Soviet Union completely terminated all types of nuclear explosions as of August 6. The Soviet Union is known to have announced its readiness to observe the moratorium after January 1, 1986, for an indefinite long time.

The newspaper [as received] quotes authoritative American scientists as saying that the main aim of the Pentagon in conducting that explosion was to destroy the impression that it really has a stake in a ban on the testing of nuclear weapons.

One cannot help seriously thinking not only about Washington's reckless practical deeds in the field of build-up of the arms race, but also the evolution of the public rhetoric of the U.S. Administration's official representatives over recent years. In signing in 1968 a multilateral treaty on non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the United States committed itself, in particular, to seek an end forever to all nuclear explosions and carry on efforts to achieve that aim.

Representatives of the U.S. Administration do not even try to pretend that they are going to adhere to the commitments under that agreement. Moreover, they are, apparently, afraid most of all to be suspected of peaceableness and readiness to observe international agreements.

U.S. Intentions Questioned

PM291710 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Observer's Opinion" under general headline "Ban Nuclear Explosions!"]

[Text] So the United States has carried out a new nuclear explosion. The whole world has been waiting with bated breath in recent weeks, wondering whether Washington would go and do it. And it has.

It is the unanimous view of the world public that the position of the Soviet Union, which unilaterally halted all nuclear explosions on 6 August, created exceptionally favorable circumstances paving the way for an eventual treaty banning all nuclear weapon tests. The world supported the Soviet initiative.

The General Assembly adopted a resolution on immediately halting and banning nuclear weapon tests, but the United States was one of three countries which voted against it. But people of goodwill continued to hope that reason would prevail in Washington. These past weeks have seen a swelling torrent of appeals to the U.S. Administration to display political realism. Some 1.5 million U.S. citizens signed a petition calling for an end to nuclear explosions. A similar appeal was made by the U.S. Methodist church, which has more than 9 million members, and by the Catholic church. Numerous U.S. public organizations and many senators and congressmen and highly authoritative U.S. scientists, physicians, and representatives of their professions have emphatically backed the moratorium. Washington has been receiving a constant stream of similar appeals from all parts of the world.

They have all been ignored. Yet another blow has been dealt to the peace-loving people's hopes for the new year. The narrow, egotistical motives of the militarists and bigwigs of the "star complex" are gaining the upper hand. The explosion in Nevada is yet another step on the path of implementation of the "star wars" program. It has been confirmed once again that the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" has a nuclear filling.

And all this is taking place 40 days after the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva, where both sides said: Nuclear war must not be unleashed and there must be no striving for military superiority.

The peoples of the world want to know: Is this the U.S. Administration's last word? What are its true intentions in 1986, which could go down in history as the year when nuclear explosions ceased?

Opposition Grows

LD291931 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 29 Dec 85

[From "The World Today" program presented by Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] Here is a television report from the State of Nevada, where the latest underground nuclear explosion was carried out yesterday. This time, according to official data, its size was 150 kilotons, which is many times larger than the U.S. atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The U.S. Department of Energy, which carries out the testing of nuclear weapons, reported that this explosion was intended to test the atomic excitation of superpowerful lasers being developed under the "star wars" program.

So far, this is the U.S. answer to the appeal by the world public, including the U.S. public, to join in the moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which, as you know, has been unilaterally declared by our country.

The latest U.S. nuclear explosion in Nevada is noteworthy in another respect, too. It clearly refutes the assurances given by the Washington administration that the infamous Strategic Defense Initiative is, allegedly, a nonnuclear program. No. As we can see, the United States intends to put atomic weapons into space as well. I should note in this connection that out of a total of $300 billion allocated by the United States to military needs for next year, $16.5 billion is planned to be directly used for creating nuclear weapons, including updating testing grounds.

Incidentally, the Washington administration has in the last few days completed drawing up the draft federal budget for the next fiscal year, 1987, and here, too, it is proposed to increase military expenditures by at least 3 percent. In short, Washington is planning years ahead for the arms race.

However, one cannot fail to note that this is causing growing concern and opposition among the U.S. public, above, all, among the scientists. Against this backdrop it is interesting to note the announcement that President Reagan's scientific advisor, George Keyworth, is retiring. He was one of the leading propagandizers of the "star wars" program. In this connection, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR writes that Keyworth had been subjected to growing criticism from many scientists and that he had compromised his role as scientific adviser.

It is indicative that the "star wars" programs are also being ever more loudly criticized in the West European countries which Washington intends to involve in the implementation of these programs. The West German newspaper WESTDEUTSCHE ALLGEMEINE writes: Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative has few friends in Europe, including in the FRG. Most experts consider the realization of this program utopian; others are afraid that it will have negative consequences for the North Atlantic union; and all of them suspect that the preparations for waging "star wars" will lead to an enormous arms race.

It is interesting that the U.S. military space programs, judging by reports in the West German press, were met with extreme skepticism even at the recently held conference of the command staff of the FRG Armed Forces.

I should also note the statement by Belgian Minister of National Defense De Donnea that his country has no intention of concluding a treaty with the United States on SDI participation. Incidentally, according to reports from Tokyo, Japan is also not rushing into this issue and intends to continue studying it next year.

Time for 'Correct Decision'

LD291739 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 29 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 29 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksey Fedorov writes:

The underground testing of a nuclear device in the Nevada proving range, the sixteenth in the USA this year, has been conducted contrary to the demands of millions of people both in the USA and outside it, of many prominent public figures and statesmen, scientists and workers in culture, who demand an end to the dangerous experiments with nuclear weapons. The explosion sponsored by the U.S. Energy Department, which is known to be responsible for the production of nuclear charges, has been a bad New Year gift to people in all countries of the world.

This is another fresh evidence that in action in the USA are, as before, the forces aiming at preventing the process of lessening tensions, whose start was marked by the results of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. These forces are apparently unhappy about the possibility, which manifested itself, to reach practical agreements directed at building up confidence between states, at curbing the arms race. The representatives of these circles have recourse, as we can see, not only to hostile propaganda in order to put spokes into the wheel of the efforts to normalise relations between the USSR and the USA.

One may ask what is the aim of those in the United States who favour a continuation of experiments with the nuclear weapons? The aim proves to be the old one -- to ensure whatever the cost military superiority as a basis for pursuing the policy of force and threats against other states. Now they hope to achieve their coveted objective of ensuring military superiority through outer space.

Meanwhile, calculations of this kind are futile. The Soviet Union has everything necessary to respond in a worthy manner to any attempts at upsetting the equilibrium in the military-strategic field. Parity is to be unshakable, and those who are unhappy about it should wake up to this fact.

But the Soviet Union strongly opposes a further build-up of the arms race. An increase in the level of nuclear confrontation will bring no benefits for any of the states. On the contrary, the swelling of the nuclear arsenals, to say nothing of placing strike weapons into outer space, would lead to a sharp destabilisation of the situation, to a growth of the military threat, including to the USA.

In its desire to put the brakes on the arms race and thus create favorable opportunities for reaching effective agreements on their limitation and reduction, the Soviet Union announced since summer this year and consistently observes the moratorium on nuclear explosions. The Soviet side expected Washington to announce in its turn a suspension of nuclear testing.

The opponents of a moratorium in the West are referring to the problem of control of its observance. Yet, this is just a lame excuse. The Soviet Union's stand is explicit -- in the field of control too it is ready for radical measures (up to on-site inspection), so that neither of the sides should have doubts as regards a strict observance of the moratorium on explosions.

A few days remain to the end of the Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium. It is high time for Washington to think it over again and take a correct decision from which peace and stability all over the world would win. It is not a continuation but an end to nuclear explosions that would accord with the "Geneva spirit."

Blast Exposes U.S.

LD291439 Moscow TASS in English 1315 GMT 29 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, 29 Dec (TASS)--TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The U.S. staged Saturday a nuclear explosion at a testing ground in Nevada which was codenamed "Goldstone". "According to official data, its capacity was 150 kilotons. The U.S. Department of Energy reports that the test was staged within the framework of the perfecting of lasers initiated by nuclear explosions, with the intention to use these devices in "star wars". Thus, the explosion brought to nought the statements of the administration that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" is allegedly a non-nuclear program.

The Nevada explosion also shows that contrary to the assurances of the White House to the effect that the U.S. will seek the lessening of nuclear threat, Washington stubbornly sticks to the policy aimed at a further buildup of nuclear arsenals on earth and at the extention of an arms race into outer space.

It is noteworthy that the Nevada test was staged in defiance of the appeals to Washington coming from the public and governments of many countries which urged the U.S. to join the moratorium on all the nuclear explosions instituted unilaterally by the Soviet Union which would remain in effect till 1 January, 1986. However, the U.S. preferred not to respond positively to these appeals under invented pretexts and sometimes without any explanations at all, and continued to implement an intensive program of underground nuclear weapon tests.

When examining the problem of the moratorium on nuclear explosions, the White House continues to speak about "difficulties of control". This invented pretext does not hold water. The influential Defense Information Center in Washington points out that the unwillingness of the White House

to agree to the discontinuation of nuclear tests is explained not by the difficulties of control, because both the USSR and the U.S. have at their disposal today rather sophisticated national technical facilities permitting to supply the sides with reliable information on the observance of the moratorium. Moreover, in order to increase the effectiveness of control, the Soviet Union supported the idea of using an international verification system, for example, by accepting the proposal of six countries--Argentina, Greece, Mexico, India, Tanzania and Sweden.

It also expressed its willingness to go even further and suggested that if the USSR and the U.S. instituted today a mutual moratorium on nuclear explosions, they should agree on some measures of the on-site control in order to remove any doubts concerning the observance of the moratorium.

It is obvious that it is not the "difficulties of control" that worry Washington. The thing is that it just does not wish to discontinue nuclear tests. They are needed by the U.S. military for perfecting new warheads for "MX", "Trident-2" and cruise missiles, for the implementation of the "star wars" program. It is also worth mentioning that in fiscal 1986 alone the U.S. Congress allocated for military needs about 300 billion dollars. Out of this sum 16.4 billion dollars will be spent on the creation of nuclear weapons, the improvement of testing grounds and the building of other military structures.

TASS Statement

LD301944 Moscow TASS in English 1939 GMT 30 Dec 85

["TASS Statement" -- TASS headline; passages in brackets were not included in a similar version transmitted by TASS at 1905 GMT on 30 Dec]

[Text] Moscow, December 30 TASS -- A new underground nuclear explosion was set off at a U.S. range in Nevada on December 28, 1985. X-ray nuclear-pumped laser was tested during that explosion condenamed "Goldstone". That laser powered by the energy of a nuclear explosion, is created in the framework of the "star wars" programme and is designed for the use in space for hitting strategic ballistic missiles, their warheads, satellites and other targets in space.

The aforementioned action has been undertaken by the U.S. Administration in conditions when the Soviet Union has been keeping from any nuclear explosions for five months now.

[According to official U.S. information, this is the 16th test in the current year and the seventh nuclear explosion since the USSR announced a unilateral moratorium on such explosions and urged the United States to follow suit.]

Continuing nuclear tests, the U.S. Government increasingly opposes itself to the clearly expressed will of the overwhelming majority of states, [the demands of the broadest sections of the world public, ignores warnings coming from many influential politicians and public figures of the United States, members of the U.S. Congress.

It is quite apparent that the development of ever new means of warfare in space and on earth continued by the United States, contradicts the admission by the U.S. leadership that a nuclear war must never be fought and that there must be no attempts to achieve military superiority. The United States' actions do not go together with its declarations of the striving to make nuclear arms "impotent and obsolete", to reduce and eliminate them.]

Concern is also evoked by the fact that what takes place now is the testing of laser equipment for anti-ballistic weapons, for the use of such weapons in space.

[As is known, space-based ABM systems are prohibited by Article Five of the treaty on the limitation of anti-ballistic missile systems, a treaty of unlimited duration, which was ratified by the United States back in 1972. Besides that, the ABM treaty prohibits the testing the ABM anywhere, except for the ranges announced and registered in advance. Such ranges for the United States are Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific and the White Sands area in New Mexico.] The holding of tests for ABM purposes at the range of Nevada can be viewed with full ground as being not in keeping with the United States obligations under the afore-mentioned treaty.

[The creation of devices for making nuclear explosions in space, apparently, also expresses the line whose continuation might lead to the violation of Article Nine of the SALT-2 treaty, and of Article Four of the 1967 treaty on space, which prohibits the emplacement of nuclear weapons in space. This also cannot but give rise to serious concern.]

TASS is authorised to state that the continued tests of U.S. nuclear weapons are assessed by the Soviet Union's leadership as not suiting the interests of solving cardinal questions of security that form the pivot of relations between the USSR and the USA, the task of improving those relations, improving the international situation as a whole.

They do not indicate either the striving to ensure favourable conditions for working out concrete measures for the prevention of an arms race in space and its termination on earth, that is, for the speeding up of the Geneva talks, which was agreed upon with the U.S. side during the summit meeting.

Nuclear tests must be stopped. This is the demand of reason, the demand of millions of people the world over and an objective political and military necessity. To pursue a responsible policy means to realise this and to draw corresponding practical conclusions. And peoples have a right to expect such conclusions from the U.S. Administration.

Perle Justification Decried

PM021631 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent A. Tolkunov "Appropriate Rejoinder": "Mr Perle and Co Are Not Willing"]

[Text] New York, 1 Jan -- First the television showed pictures of a demonstration outside the nuclear test site in the Nevada desert. People are carrying placards: "By halting tests we will halt the arms race and save the world!"

Then comes another report: Yet another explosion, codenamed "Goldstone," has been carried out. A PBS television newscaster claims that "it was required in order to test star weapons components -- laser installations using the energy of a nuclear explosion." Then the arrogant Assistant Defense Secretary R. Perle, favorite of the "hawks ," appeared on the screen.

"We cannot halt nuclear tests," he declared gravely, "because they are the guarantee of our security and of our nuclear arsenal's reliability, combat readiness, and working capability [rabotosposobnost] (what an image!). Anyway the Russians cannot be trusted..."

P. Warnke, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, takes issue with the Pentagonite.

Of all people he should know all the subtleties of nuclear arms negotiations:

"In 1963," he said, "having concluded the treaty banning tests in the three environments, we pledged to bring the matter to a conclusion and end all explosions. In November 1977, when talks on this problem were still in progress, the Russians accepted all our counterproposals. It was only disagreements within the J. Carter administration and the opposition of people like you, Mr Perle, that prevented matters from reaching a logical conclusion. And in 1981 the Reagan administration declared that it was totally opposed to an all-embracing accord."

All the Pentagonite could do in reply was to make a clumsy attempt to refer to the need to "check the reliability" of U.S. nuclear systems.

"But that is not so. In the majority of explosions we have carried out throughout history," Warnke retorted, "we have not been 'checking' old charges, but 'streamlining' new ones, and now star weapons as well."

The darling of the Washington "hawks" could find no convincing reply to this. Mr Perle and Co are simply not willing....

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: PENTAGON TO CONTINUE ANTISATELLITE WEAPON TESTS

LD260016 Moscow TASS in English 2357 GMT 25 Dec 85

[Text] Washington, December 25 TASS -- TASS correspondent V. Legantsov reports:

The Pentagon intends to continue activities in developing anti-satellite weapons despite the decision legislatively taken by the U.S. Congress to disallow tests of the ASAT anti-satellite weapons system in the current fiscal year, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST reports today, referring to officials of the Defense Department.

As one of the possibilities of "neutralizing" the legislation the Pentagon is considering the version of launching an anti-satellite missile not against a definite target but against the so-called point in outer space. Such a test was already held in 1984.

WASHINGTON POST cites a representative of the U.S. Air Force as stating in no uncertain terms that the Pentagon will find a possibility of continuing its program, without formally violating the congressional ban. The Pentagon's insistent desire to continue anti-satellite weapon tests is not at all accidental. Perfection of anti-satellite weapons, wrote the newspaper NEW YORK TIMES, is directly linked with the Pentagon's "star wars" program. The newspaper CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR cites experts' opinion on a real possibility of developing under the guise of anti-satellite weapons components for an anti-missile defense system.

The Pentagon representatives' scornful attitude to the decision of the U.S. supreme legislative body, their statements that it is not a serious obstacle to continuation of tests of anti-satellite weapons can hardly be explained only as soldier's bluntness characteristic of high-placed officials of the U.S. Defense Department. It is not ruled out that the possibility of by-passing the law was provided for when it was worded by the authors themselves.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

TASS: NEVADA TESTS CONNECTED WITH X-RAY LASER DEVELOPMENT

LD221340 Moscow TASS in English 1325 GMT 22 Dec 85

[Text] New York, 22 Dec (TASS)--According to the ABC Television Company, underground nuclear exploisions are an important component part of the large-scale work aimed at creating space strike weapons. Thus, the latest of the tests at a testing ground in Nevada state planned by the Pentagon is directly connected with the development of an X-ray laser which, as ABC maintains, is regarded as one of possible means of destroying missiles in outer space. An explosion of a hydrogen bomb is the source of energy for the X-ray laser. The TV company points out in this connection that the implementation of the program runs counter to the statements of President Reagan to the effect that the "Strategic Defense Initiative" put forward by him includes only non-nuclear weapons. All the planned tests within the framework of the "star wars" program will be continued, ABC underlines.

The main danger coming from the SDI whose principal component part of the creation of a large-scale anti-ballistic missile defense system with space-based elements is that it can undermine the whole of the arms control process. Joyce Cjedoac, coordinator of the national coalition "Stop Star Wars Initiative" said: The SDI is aimed at upsetting the existing military balance between the USSR and the U.S. It reduces to naught all the basic agreements between the two countries in the sphere of arms limitation and primarily the Soviet-American Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty signed in 1972. Allegations of the Reagan Administration to the effect that the anti-ballistic missile space shield will be purely defensive do not hold water, J. Chediac pointed out. "Star Wars" is a program of building up the potential for delivering a first strike at the USSR, she stressed. Its implementation will only whip up the arms race, destabilize the international situation and aggravate the war threat.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

AFP: U.S. OFFER TO WITNESS NEVADA TESTS DENOUNCED

AU261416 Paris AFP in English 1322 GMT 26 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 26 Dec (AFP)--The Soviet NOVOSTI news agency today denounced as "outrageous" U.S. President Ronald Reagan's proposal for Soviet scientists to attend nuclear tests in the Nevada desert.

The proposal was first issued in July and renewed in a recent letter to Mr. Gorbachev. According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the letter also rejected a Soviet call to join Moscow's moratorium on nuclear testing, due to expire at the end of the year.

"The United States has made a basically outrageous proposal to our country to send Soviet specialists with their instruments to the Nevada desert to record the strength of American underground nuclear explosions," NOVOSTI said in a commentary signed by Yuriy Zhikov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace.

The agency said the proposal "did not correspond to any practical need" as Soviet monitoring equipment had accurately monitored a test in Nevada on August 18 and "five others" conducted since. It also dismissed as "nonsense" the U.S. refusal to join the Soviet test moratorium. The Soviets announced the moratorium on August 6 effective until the end of the year and have pledged to extend it on condition that Washington also agree to halt tests.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

IZVESTIYA: WOLFOWITZ WARNS NEW ZEALAND ON PORT CALLS

PM190946 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent I. Kovalev "Notes Apropos": "Feat of a Chain Reaction"]

[Text] Manila--Reports from Wellington that a bill prohibiting ships with nuclear weapons on board from calling at New Zealand ports has been submitted for consideration by the New Zealand Parliament has prompted a new series of "warnings" from U.S. officials.

P. Wolfowitz, U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, who is in Singapore to discuss "regional security" questions, immediately said: If the bill is adopted Washington will abjure all its commitments to New Zealand within the framework of the ANZUS (Australia, New Zealand, and the United States) military alliance.

These warnings are not new, and the other day New Zealand Prime Minister Lange observed in this connection that a revision by Washington of the ANZUS statute would change little since the agreements within the framework of the bloc envisage only consultations, not automatic military aid for "a member of the alliance under attack."

Australian radio reports that the United States has breathing space of at least 6 months: the time it will take the New Zealand parliament to approve the bill. But Washington's nerves are already very frayed.

Commentaries published in the local press offer the following explanation of this: The Americans are not so much dismayed at the possible loss of New Zealand as a staging post on their naval routes, as frightened lest Wellington's decisions cause a chain reaction in dozens of other countries where U.S. ships carrying "nuclear death" call.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE IDEA DETAILED BY SOVIET PAPER

FM301443 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Dec 85 First Edition p 3

[Article by Ye. Sankov in response to reader's letter under the rubric "Reader Is Interested": "Time to Decide and Struggle"--first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Excerpts] "Could you describe in more detail the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe? M. Petrov, Moscow."

This very important idea put forward by the peace champions is now attracting enormous attention from the region's public. It is no accident that over 100 representatives of 45 various parliamentary parties of Sweden, Finland, Norway, Denmark, and Iceland and the local parliaments of Greenland, the Faroe Islands, and the Aland archipelago met recently in Copenhagen. Those taking part included the ministers of Sweden and Finland, the foreign ministers of Denmark and Finland, representatives of the parliaments of Norway, Finland, and Denmark, and eminent politicians and public figures.

At the Copenhagen meeting O. Palme called for work to be continued with a view to achieving unity on the question of the zone. Finnish Prime Minister K. Sorsa favored further headway. Representatives of the social democratic parties of various countries submitted a proposal for the inauguration of a joint commission of parliamentarians of the North East countries on questions connected with forming a nuclear-free zone.

As for the right-wing bourgeois parties, particularly those of Norway and Denmark, their delegates as a whole adopted a negative stance reflecting the NATO line. The zone's opponents, and they were in the minority, sought to "link" its creation to the solution of other international questions. Some, for instance, proposed that nothing be done about the zone until the specific results of the process initiated in Geneva become known. This stance can hardly be called constructive.

The Soviet Union has frequently supported the creation of nuclear-free zones. "We are prepared," Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has said, "to take part in appropriate guarantees where required... We also believe that states which do not have nuclear weapons and do not have them on their territories are fully entitled to their security under reliable international law guarantees -- guarantees that nuclear weapons will not be used against them."

The Soviet Union has also expressed the readiness to examine the question of some measures, and important ones at that, with respect to its own territory adjacent to the zone which would help to strengthen its nuclear-free status. In particular the USSR would be prepared to discuss with interested sides the question of lending nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea area.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

MOSCOW: GREECE FAVORS NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE IN BALKANS

KD251430 Moscow in Greek to Greece 1730 GMT 25 Dec 85

[Station commentary]

[Text] The Greek Government has made a positive response to the appeal by the leaders of Bulgaria and Romania for joint efforts aimed at turning the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone. Our commentator writes:

It is well-known that for several decades now U.S. nuclear warheads have been deployed in Greece under the pretext that this meets U.S. [as heard] national security interests. For this reason, according to observers, it will to a great extent depend on Athens how quickly the idea of a nuclear-free Balkans can be implemented.

The removal of U.S. nuclear warheads from Greece has recently gotten underway. Greek Prime Minister Andreas Papandreou stressed recently that this is to be the final removal of nuclear weapons and that there was no question of their being modernized or replaced, since the policy of the Greek Government concerning all matters related to a nuclear-free Balkans remains unchanged.

In spite of all this, the majority of the Balkan states are wondering whether Washington intends to take into account the decision of its ally. For the time being, it is clear that Washington is keeping silent. It appears that the United States is deliberately engaged in delay tactics in order to again avoid worsening their mutual relations since the Greece of today is not the same as the one the United States had dealings with 20 or even 10 years ago. A lot has changed in the country, and its people are determined to struggle for the final removal of U.S. nuclear weapons. This is confirmed by the continuously expanding movement in Greece, which is also supported by its government, for the creation of nuclear-free zones.

In the Soviet Union, our commentator continues, they look with understanding on Greece's intention to rid its soil of nuclear explosives. It is no accident that the Soviet Union has already stated on many occasions that it is ready to undertake concrete obligations on the nonuse of nuclear weapons against countries which would be part of a nuclear-free zone -- in other words, against countries which would eliminate the production, acquisition, and deployment of nuclear weapons on their territory. Such guarantees of the Soviet Union could be expressed in either bilateral treaties with each of the states in the nuclear-free zone or in a multilateral treaty. The important factor in this regard is that the undertaking of the countries not to have nuclear weapons on their territories should also encompass foreign military bases or other installations.

It is, of course, possible that other problems and other proposals could arise. However, if there were political goodwill among all the interested parties, these issues could be adjusted and resolved toward the achievement of a mutual agreement. The Soviet Union, faithful to the idea of a reduction in nuclear confrontation, is ready, as it has repeatedly stated, to reach agreement on the final removal of nuclear explosives from the continent. In its effort to achieve this goal, our country hails every constructive initiative in this field, on the condition that the principle of equality and equal security of both sides is preserved. The Soviet Union believes in the benefits both of bilateral and multilateral contacts and talks on the problem of creating a nuclear-free zone in the Balkans and other regions of Europe.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR EXAMINES SUPPORT IN UK FOR NUCLEAR-FREE ZONES

LD070007 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 6 Jan 86

[From the "Vantage Point" with commentary by Boris Belitskiy]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev's reply last week to a message from Ken Livingston, the leader of the Greater London Council [GLC], has stimulated interest both here in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in the movement in Britain for the establishment of nuclear-free zones. This is the subject discussed in "Vantage Point" by Boris Belitskiy today:

Last month Ken Livingstone the GLC leader elected by the majority party, Labor, wrote to Mikhail Gorbachev outlining the views of British supporters of nuclear-free zones and the aims of the movement, stressing the need for progress in international disarmament talks and welcoming Soviet initiatives in this area. In his reply, Mikhail Gorbachev expressed full understanding of the concern felt by people in Britain over the dangerous developments in the world and reaffirmed Soviet resolve to work for radical reductions in nuclear arms and for keeping weapons out of space. He also welcomed the movement of municipal councils and other organizations to establish nuclear-free zones. Such zones, he feels, are not wishful thinking, not idealistic dreams but a positive development in international affairs expressing the peoples' will for peace, cooperation, and international relaxation. And the Soviet leader stated that if Britain were to renounce nuclear weapons and remove foreign nuclear bases from her territory the USSR would guarantee that no Soviet nuclear weapons were targetted on British territory or ever used against Britain. Such guarantees could, moreover, be formalized in an official agreement, taking into account all the military aspects of the matter.

The Soviet leader's message of reply to the GLC head has naturally aroused much interest among people in this country, and not only in this country, in this new form of antiwar activity, which has been spreading in Britain. In reply to many questions I, for one, have been explaining to people here that back in November 1980, Manchester gave birth to this movement by proclaiming itself a nuclear-free zone. By the spring of 1984, as many as 170 municipal councils in Britain had taken similar decisions, the GLC among them. Its decision forbids the deployment in, or transportation through, Greater London of any types of nuclear weapons or radioactive material. Following the example of so many urban areas, whole areas in various parts of the United Kingdom have likewise delcared themselves nuclear-free zones. It's estimated that the population of these zones exceeds 50 million people [figure as heard], more than half the people of Britain.

The strength of Britain's antiwar movement was demonstrated to the world once again last month over 25,000 women from all over the country linked arms at Greenham Common, turning their backs, as they put it, on the military lunacy inside the base to mark the 6th anniversary of the NATO decision to deploy nuclear missiles in Western Europe. During these entirely peaceful protests, in the course of which the women decorated the 9-mile perimeter fence around the base with what they called tokens of life in the form of beautifully embroidered banners and flowers, a United States water cannon vehicle was spotted and filmed as it was rolled out for exercise.

Earlier, it has been strenuously denied that any such equipment for use against the people of Britain was stationed at this or other American bases. There was something ominously symbolic, many people felt, in this show of American strength against British demonstrators as the United States keeps increasing its military presence in the country. And such concern, it seems to me, it is well justified.

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

USSR'S LOMEYKO ANNOUNCES EXCHANGE OF SOVIET, U.S. ADDRESSES

LD271926 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 27 Dec 85

["At a Briefing at the Press Centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs" --TASS headline, quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 27 Dec (TASS)--By mutual arrangement, Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and President Ronald Reagan of the United States will exchange New-Year's congratulations. The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee will address the people of the United States while the President of the USA will address the Soviet people on 1 January, 1986.

Soviet and foreign journalists were told this today at a briefing at the press centre of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Vladimir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, answered journalists' questions. In answer to the question whether Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his today's speech at a meeting in the Kremlin with the heads of diplomatic missions of foreign states accredited in the Soviet Union, touched upon the question of a moratorium on all types of nuclear tests, he quoted respective excerpts from Mikhail Gorbachev's speech:

"The question of nuclear explosions is now in the focus of attention of statesmen and broad public. These explosions have rocked the earth for several decades now. It is time to put an end to that. We are convinced that this is within the limits of the possible.

We have urged and continue urging the USA to follow the Soviet Union's good example and end all nuclear explosions. Should our two biggest powers come out jointly on the issue of so much importance for the whole of mankind, this would be a step of a truly outstanding significance."

"Since references are often made to the so-called verification problems as the main pretext for evading a resolution of that issue. I will stress once again most definitely that his problem will not be a stumbling block as far as the Soviet Union is concerned. The Soviet Union is prepared to take most resolute steps down to on-site inspection as regards control over the ending of nuclear testing".

/9738
CSO: 5200/1222

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

PUBLICIST SAYS USSR TO ADHERE TO MORATORIUM

LD092118 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1730 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] The Soviet Union declared a moratorium on all nuclear tests as of 6 August last year to 1 January this year, and invited the United States to join it. Washington replied with a series of underground nuclear explosions. Our permanent Moscow correspondent, Stafan Babiak, asked a leading Soviet publicist, Nikolay Shishlin, how the Soviet Union intends to proceed further:

[Begin Shishlin recording] The Soviet Union is now formally freed from the pledge to uphold the nuclear test moratorium, but as you are aware, our country is not renewing nuclear explosions. We believe this question is one of the most important from the viewpoint of reaching actual steps in the effort to stop the arms race and to strengthen international security.

I believe that much depends now not only upon the Soviet Union's restraint. That, it can be seen, remains a reality of international policy. Important above all today is the U.S. attitude. It is very important for us that the Soviet Union's friends, who energetically supported our standpoint on the moratorium question, show solidarity with our political steps. The reaction of the wide international public, western countries and the U.S. partners, will be of exceptional importance for us. I believe that Washington cannot continue with nuclear tests forever. The gamble is with the fate of more of humanity. The Americans in fact have now been given extra time to think it over. The possiblity of making an exceptionally important step in the interest of strengthening international security depends upon their position, and I hope it is a seriously considered position. [end recording]

/8309
CSO: 5200/1229

NUCLEAR TESTING AND FREE ZONE PROPOSALS

XINHUA REPORTS 'HARSH' U.S. ATTITUDE TOWARD SOUTH PACIFIC

OW161026 Beijing XINHUA in English 0829 GMT 16 Jan 86

["Roundup: U.S. Harsh Attitude Towards South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone (by Sun Tingzheng)" -- XINHUA headline]

[Text] Canberra, January 16 (XINHUA) -- A U.S. congressmen delegation came to the region and uttered hardening words to both New Zealand and Australia, urging them to alter their nuclear-ban policy. This happened before a South Pacific Forum delegation is going to visit five nuclear powers, seeking their endorsement to the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty.

The 12-member U.S. House of Representatives Armed Services Committee delegation is led by New York Democrat Sam Stratton. Before leaving Washington on January 8, Sam Stratton announced that the delegation will hold talks with the recipient nations about the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty as well as the influence the treaty would have on the ANZUS alliance (among Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.).

The delegation has already visited New Zealand, French Polynesia and Antarctica before their arrival in Australia on January 14.

After meeting Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke in Sydney yesterday, the U.S. delegation at a press conference gave the ANZUS allies a rather serious warning. Stratton said the South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty "would proliferate the kind of thing the New Zealanders have been doing", and "some Australian politicians" were as "unrealistic" as the New Zealanders over the proposal to create a South Pacific nuclear-free zone. He said bluntly that Australia and the U.S. had differences of opinion over the nuclear-free zone treaty. The U.S. opposed a total ban on nuclear testing, which was a vital element of maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent.

Another member of the delegation Californian Republican Bob Badham said that New Zealand's action has been a "slap in the face" for the United States. However, he added that New Zealand is a "treasured and beloved ally", and the U.S. wants to resolve the problem amicably "in the realm of a family discussion". He noted that the reason why the congressmen had paid the visit to Australia was to consider whether "there are some sort of negotiations that can be done between the Australian Government and New Zealand." He declared that Washington might have to send New Zealand a "heavy signal".

The South Pacific nuclear-free zone treaty was adopted unanimously by thirteen member countries of the South Pacific Forum in Rarotonga, Cook Islands, last August. The treaty provides for ban on nuclear testing, the dumping of nuclear waste in the sea, the manufacture or storage of nuclear devices, and the diversion of nuclear materials from peaceful to military use. The treaty agrees that the participant countries decide by themselves whether to allow foreign nuclear armed or powered ships into their ports providing that nuclear weapons will not be used against any South Pacific country.

Observers here believe that a tit for tat struggle will continue among the ANZUS allies. Washington would not endure the "slap in the face", but still hopes to maintain close tripartite relations by exerting certain pressure on its two allies. There is no strong indication, however, that New Zealand and Australia will succumb to this pressure.

The route to South Pacific nuclear-free zone is not smooth. Four of the thirteen countries in the region haven't yet signed the treaty.

More tortuous is that, the French Government's hard commitment's to continuing the nuclear tests at Mururoa in the South Pacific apart from the controversial attitude of the United States.

/9738
CSO: 5200/4023

BRIEFS

TASS ON U.S. INTERCEPTOR TEST--Washington, 11 Jan (TASS)--According to a report of the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency, an interceptor missile was tested over the White Sands missile range, New Mexico, within the framework of the notorious "star wars" program. The Pentagon plans to use the weapon in a large-scale anti-missile system with space-based elements. According to a spokesman for the Army Strategic Defense Command, the missile "came within a predicted accuracy" of a target at an altitude of 4.5 kilometers. This is the fourth such test carried out by the U.S. Army. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, at least five more such tests are planned. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 11 Jan 86] /8309

TASS: U.S. 'SECRET' UNDERGROUND TESTS--Washington, 15 Jan (TASS)--The United States made from 12 to 19 secret underground tests of various types of nuclear weapons on the Nevada test range in a period from 1982 to 1984 inclusive. This was reported here, referring to reliable sources, by the private research organisation, the Natural Resources Defence Council. Over that period the U.S. Department of Energy made in Nevada 44 officially announced underground nuclear explosions. The council staff-member, specialist in the sphere of nuclear armaments William Arkin has told journalists that the Washington administration is trying to conceal from the public its activities in the sphere of underground nuclear tests, while deliberately exaggerating "accomplishments" of the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" allegedly intended to "put an end to nuclear weapons for all time." Touching upon the report of the Council of Environmental Quality, the newspaper WASHINGTON POST stresses that universal attention in the problem of underground nuclear tests sharply increased when in summer last year the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on these tests and proposed that the United States should follow its example. Many scientists in the United States stated that a ban on explosions was the best means of retarding the pace of the arms race, recalled the newspaper WASHINGTON POST. The American Administration, however, turned down the Soviet proposal and stated that nuclear explosions were necessary to develop new weapons and to reaffirm confidence in its old specimens. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT 15 Jan 86] /8309

UNDERGROUND NUCLEAR TESTS--New York, 31 Dec (TASS)--Mayors of three cities of Utah state have demanded that underground nuclear tests at the Nevada testing site be terminated without delay and talks be resumed with the Soviet Union with a view to concluding a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests. The proclamations signed by the mayors of Salt Lake City, Provo and Riverton, say that radioactive fallout from nuclear tests in neighboring Nevada cause cancer among residents of this state. The ongoing nuclear tests harbor an obvious and unpassing hazard to the health and welfare of the residents of Utah. The proclamation by P. Polleth, mayor of Salt Lake City, underlines that reaching a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon tests is real, it would meet the interests of U.S. security and its compliance could well be verified. [Text] [Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 31 Dec 85 LD] /9738

CSO: 5200/1222

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV ISSUES STATEMENT ON ELIMINATING ALL NUCLEAR WEAPONS

Gorbachev Issues Statement

PM151623 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jan 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Statement by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"--PRAVDA headline; uppercase passages published in boldface]

[Identical versions were carried in IZVESTIYA, TASS English, Moscow Television Service ("Vremya" newscast), and Moscow Domestic Service; last two versions were announcer-read]

[Text] The New Year of 1986 has begun to tick off its days. This will be an important, one might say pivotal, year in the Soviet State's history -- the year of the 27th CPSU Congress. The congress will determine the main frontiers of Soviet society's political, socioeconomic, and spiritual development up to the next millenium. It will adopt a program for accelerating our peaceful building. All of the CPSU's efforts are aimed at ensuring the further improvement of the Soviet people's life. A change for the better in the international arena is needed. It is awaited and demanded by the peoples of the Soviet Union, the peoples of the entire world.

Proceeding from this, at the beginning of the New Year the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and Soviet Government adopted a decision on a number of major, fundamental foreign policy actions. Their point is to promote the improvement of the international situation to the maximum extent. They are dictated by the need to overcome the negative, confrontational tendencies that have built up in recent years and to clear the way for the curtailment of the nuclear arms race on earth and its prevention in space, a general reduction in the war danger, and for the establishment of trust as an inalienable component of relations between states.

I.

The main one of these actions is a concrete program, calculated for a precisely determined period of time, for the complete liquidation of nuclear weapons throughout the world.

The Soviet Union proposes, acting gradually and consistently, the implementation and completion of the process of freeing the world of nuclear weapons within the next 15 years, before the end of the present century.

The 20th century has given mankind the energy of the atom. But this great achievement of reason cannot become an instrument of suicide for people.

Can this contradiction be resolved? We are convinced that it can. Finding effective ways to eliminate nuclear weapons is a feasible task if its solution is tackled without delay.

The Soviet Union proposes beginning, as of 1986, the implementation of a program for freeing mankind from the fear of nuclear catastrophe. The fact that the United Nations has proclaimed this year International Peace Year serves as an additional political and moral stimulus. Here it is necessary to rise above national egoism, tactical calculations, and disputes and dissensions whose significance is negligible in comparison with the preservation of the main value -- peace and a reliable future. The energy of the atom must serve only peace; our socialist state has invariably advocated and continues to advocate this.

Ours was the country which took the lead in raising, back in 1946, the question of banning the production and use of atomic weapons and using nuclear energy for peaceful purposes for mankind's benefit.

How in practical terms does the Soviet Union see the procedure for reducing nuclear arms -- both delivery vehicles and charges -- down to their complete liquidation? In summary form our proposals boil down to the following.

FIRST STAGE. Over a period of 5-8 years the Soviet Union and the United States will halve the nuclear arms which can reach each other's territory. No more than 6,000 charges will be retained on the delivery vehicles of this kind which they are left with.

It goes without saying that such a reduction is possible only given the mutual renunciation by the Soviet Union and the United States of the development [sozdaniye, testing, and deployment of space strike arms. As the Soviet Union has warned repeatedly, the development of space strike weapons will cancel hopes for the reduction of nuclear arms on earth.

The first stage will see the reaching and implementation of a decision on the complete liquidation of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles in the European zone -- both ballistic and cruise missiles -- as a first stage on the path to freeing the European Continent of nuclear weapons.

Here the United States must adopt a pledge not to supply its strategic missiles and medium-range missiles to other countries; Britain and France must adopt a pledge not to build up their own corresponding nuclear arms.

Right from the start it is necessary for the Soviet Union and the United States to agree to ending any nuclear explosions and to call on other states to join in this moratorium as swiftly as possible.

And if the first stage of nuclear disarmament applies to the Soviet Union and the United States, it is because it is precisely they that must set an example for the other nuclear powers. We stated this with the utmost frankness to U.S. President R. Reagan during the Geneva meeting.

THE SECOND STAGE. During this stage, which must begin no later than 1990 and last 5-7 years, the other nuclear powers will begin to join in nuclear disarmament. They would first adopt a pledge to freeze all of their nuclear arms and not to have them on the territories of other countries.

During this period the Soviet Union and the United States will continue the reductions on which they agreed during the first stage, will implement further measures to eliminate their own medium-range nuclear arms, and will freeze their tactical nuclear means.

After the Soviet Union and the United States complete the 50-percent reduction of their relevant arms during the second stage, yet another radical step will be taken: All of the nuclear powers will eliminate tactical nuclear weapons, that is, means with a range (radius of operation) of up to 1,000 km.

At this stage the Soviet-U.S. accord on a ban on space strike arms would have to become multilateral, with compulsory participation by the leading industrial powers.

All nuclear powers would end nuclear weapons tests.

A ban would be established on the creation of nonnuclear arms based on new physical principles and on approaching nuclear or other means of mass destruction in terms of their casualty-producing capabilities [porazhayushiye sposobnosti]

THE THIRD STAGE will begin no later than 1995, during which the elimination of all remaining nuclear arms will be completed. /By the end of 1999 no nuclear weapons will be left on earth. A universal accord on ensuring that these weapons are never revived again will be elaborated.

It is envisaged that special procedures for the destruction of nuclear weapons and for the dismantling, conversion [pereoborudovaniye], or destruction of delivery vehicles will be elaborated. In the process, the quantity of weapons subject to elimination at each stage, the places where they will be destroyed, and so forth will be agreed on.

Verification of the armaments subject to destruction and limitation would be implemented via both national technical means and onsite inspections. The Soviet Union is prepared to reach agreement on any other additional verification measures.

The adoption of the program of nuclear disarmament that we are proposing would certainly have a beneficial influence on the talks being held in bilateral and multilateral forums. It would determine clearly defined routes and landmarks, would establish specific timetables for reaching and implementing accords, and would make talks purposeful and single-minded. The dangerous tendency whereby the pace of the arms race outstrips the fruitfulness of talks would be stopped.

Thus, we propose entering the third millennium without nuclear weapons on the basis of mutually acceptable and strictly verified accords. If the U.S. Administration -- as it has repeatedly stated -- is committed to the goal of completely eliminating nuclear weapons everywhere, it is being given a practical opportunity to actually do just that. Instead of spending the next 10-15 years creating new weapons in space, which are extremely dangerous for mankind and are allegedly intended to make nuclear arms unnecessary, is it not more sensible to tackle the destruction of these arms themselves -- and ultimately reduce them to zero? The Soviet Union, I repeat, proposes precisely this course.

The Soviet Union appeals to all peoples and states -- primarily, of course, the nuclear states -- to support the program for eliminating nuclear weapons by the year 2000. It is quite obvious to any unprejudiced person that nobody will lose out as a result of the implementation of such a program, but everyone will benefit. It is a problem of importance to all mankind; it can and must be resolved jointly. And the faster the program is translated into the language of practical action, the more secure life on our planet will be.

II.

Guided by this approach and the desire to take yet another practical step in the context of a nuclear disarmament program, the Soviet Union has made an important decision.

We will extend our unilateral moratorium on all nuclear explosions, which expired 31 December 1985, for 3 months. This moratorium will stay in force even longer if the United States, for its part, also ends nuclear tests. We again suggest to the United States that it join this initiative, whose importance is obvious to literally everyone in the world.

Clearly, it was by no means easy for us to make this decision. The Soviet Union cannot show unilateral restraint with regard to nuclear tests ad infinitum. But the stakes are too high and the level of responsibility is too high for us not to try all possibilities for influencing the position of others by force of example.

All specialists, scientists, politicians, and military men agree that ending tests will close, in a very reliable way, channels for improving nuclear weapons. This is the paramount task. Merely reducing nuclear arsenals without banning nuclear weapons tests does not provide a way out of the dilemma of the nuclear threat, since the remaining weapons are modernized and the opportunity for creating increasingly sophisticated and deadly nuclear weapons and for testing new varieties of them at test sites is retained.

Consequently, ending tests is a practical step toward eliminating nuclear arms.

I want to say the following at the outset. There are no grounds for possible references to verification as an obstacle to establishing a moratorium on nuclear explosions. We categorically state that verification is not a problem for us. If the United States embarks on ending all nuclear explosions on a reciprocal basis the proper verification of observance of the moratorium will be fully ensured by national technical means and with the help of international procedures -- with onsite inspections where necessary. We invite the United States to agree to this.

The Soviet Union resolutely advocates that the moratorium be a bilateral and subsequently, multilateral action. We also advocate the resumption of trilateral talks (with the participation of the Soviet Union, the United States, and Britain) on the complete and general prohibition of nuclear weapons tests. This could be done immediately, even this month. We are also prepared to immediately start multilateral talks, in which all the nuclear powers would participate, on the prohibition of tests within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

The nonaligned countries propose holding consultations for the purpose of extending the validity of the 1963 Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space, and underwater to underground tests which are currently not covered by this treaty. The Soviet Union also agrees with this.

Since last summer we have been calling on the United States to follow our example and end nuclear explosions. So far Washington has not done so despite the protests and demands of the public and despite the will of the majority of the world's states. By detonating more and more new nuclear devices, the U.S. side is continuing its pursuit of the unrealizable dream of military superiority. This is a fruitless and dangerous policy; a policy unworthy of the level of civilization which contemporary society has reached.

In view of the absence of a positive reaction from the United States, the Soviet Union had every right to renew nuclear tests as early as 1 January 1986. If the familiar "logic" of the arms race were to be followed, then that, evidently was how one ought to have acted.

But the whole point is that a decisive break must be made with precisely that kind of logic, if one is permitted to use that word. We are making yet another attempt in this direction. Otherwise, the process of military rivalry will be transformed into an avalanche in which any control over the development of events would become impossible. It is inadmissible to submit to the elemental forces of a nuclear race. This would mean acting contrary to the voice of reason and to the human sense of self-preservation. New, bold approaches, new political thinking, and a sharpened awareness of responsibility for the destiny of the peoples are what is required.

The U.S. Administration again has additional time in which to weigh our proposals about ending nuclear explosions and to respond positively to them. Precisely this sort of reaction will be expected of Washington throughout the world.

The Soviet Union addresses its appeal to the U.S. President and Congress, and to the U.S. people.

There exists the possibility of halting the process of nuclear arms improvement and of trying out [otrabotka] new arms of this kind. This opportunity must not be missed. The Soviet proposals place the Soviet Union and the United States on an equal footing. They contain no attempts to outsmart or score points over the other side. We propose embarking on the path of sensible and responsible solutions.

III.

For implementation of the program for the reduction and elimination of nuclear arsenals, the entire existing system of talks must be brought into play and the mechanisms of disarmament must operate at the highest possible efficiency.

The Soviet-U.S. negotiations on nuclear and space armaments are being resumed in Geneva in a matter of days. During the meeting with President R. Reagan in Geneva last November, we had a frank discussion on a whole range of problems which are the subject of these negotiations; that is, on space, strategic offensive arms, and medium-range nuclear means. It was decided that the negotiations be accelerated and this understanding cannot remain just a declaration.

The Soviet delegation in Geneva will have instructions to act strictly in conformity with this understanding. We expect the U.S. side to adopt an equally constructive approach, above all, on the question of space. Space must be kept peaceful, strike weapons must not be deployed there. They must not even be created. And let there be the strictest verification in this case, which includes allowing inspections at the relevant laboratories.

Mankind is at a crucial stage in the new space era. It is time to abandon stone age ways of thinking, when the main preoccupation was to provide oneself with a bigger club or a heavier rock. We are against weapons in space. Our material and intellectual potential enables the Soviet Union to create any weapon if we are forced to do so. But we are aware of our full responsibility to present and future generations. It is our profound belief that we must go into the 3d millennium not with a "star wars" program, but with large-scale projects for the peaceful exploration of space through the efforts of all mankind. We are proposing practical efforts to elaborate and implement these projects. It is one very important way of ensuring progress over our entire planet and the formation of a reliable system of security for all.

Preventing the arms race from spreading to space means removing the obstacle to deep reductions of nuclear armaments. The Soviet proposal on halving the corresponding Soviet and U.S. nuclear armaments is on the table at Geneva and is an important step on the path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Obstructing the solution of the space problem means not wanting to halt the arms race on earth. This must be said bluntly and for all to hear. It is no accident that the supporters of the nuclear arms race are also zealous supporters of the "star wars" program. They are two aspects of the same policy which is hostile to people's interests.

Now, the European aspect of the nuclear problem. The situation where, contrary to common sense and contrary to European peoples' national interests, U.S. first-strike missiles are continuing to be deployed in certain West European countries is extremely worrying. This problem has been discussed for many years. And, in the meantime, security conditions in Europe have become worse and worse.

It is time to halt this development of events and cut this Gordian knot. Long ago the Soviet Union proposed ridding Europe of both medium-range and tactical nuclear weapons. The proposal remains in force. As a first, radical, step in that direction we are now proposing, as I said above, the elimination of all Soviet and U.S. ballistic and cruise missiles in the European zone in the first stage of the program we are putting forward.

The achievement of tangible results at the Geneva talks would give our program for the total elimination of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 considerable material substance.

IV.

The Soviet Union also considers it an entirely realistic task to totally eliminate those barbarous weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, during this century.

Some progress has recently been noted at the talks on chemical weapons which are taking place within the framework of the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. But these talks have been impermissably dragged out. We are in favor of intensifying the talks on the conclusion of an effective, verifiable international convention on the banning of chemical weapons and the destruction of existing stockpiles of these weapons, as was agreed with U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva.

In the matter of a ban on chemical weapons, as on other disarmament issues, a fresh outlook is required of all participants in talks. I wish to stress quite clearly that the Soviet Union stands for the speediest, total elimination of these weapons and the industrial base for their manufacture itself. We are prepared to ensure the prompt

declaration of locations of enterprises for the production of chemical weapons and the cessation of production, to begin the elaboration of procedures for the destruction of the relevant production base. And to embark, soon after the convention comes into force, on the elimination of chemical weapon stockpiles. All this would take place under strict control [kontrol], including international on-site verifications [proverki na mestakh].

The radical solution of this problem would also be promoted by certain interim steps. For instance, it would be possible to agree, on a multilateral basis, on not transferring chemical weapons to anyone and not deploying them on the territory of other states. As for the Soviet Union, it has always strictly adhered to these principles in its practical policy. We call on other states to follow this example and display the same restraint.

V.

Alongside the removal of weapons of mass destruction from state's arsenals the Soviet Union proposes that conventional arms and armed forces become the subject of negotiated reductions.

An accord at the Vienna talks could be the signal for the start of a movement in this direction. At present the outlines are emerging, so to speak, of a possible decision on the reduction of Soviet and U.S. troops and a subsequent freeze on the level of armed forces of the opposing groupings in central Europe. The Soviet Union and our Warsaw Pact allies are filled with the will to achieve success at the Vienna talks. If the other side really seeks this too, then 1986 could be a milestone for the Vienna talks. We proceed on the basis that a possible accord on troop reductions naturally requires reasonable monitoring [kontrol]. We are prepared for that. As for the observance of a commitment on freezing the numerical strength of troops, in addition to national technical means it would be possible to establish permanent monitoring points [punkty kontrolya] to monitor the entry of any troops contingents into the reduction zone.

Now, turning to that important forum, the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe. It is called upon to ensure the creation of barriers in the path of the use of force and covert prepartations for war -- on land, at sea, or in the air. Possibilities for this have emerged.

In our opinion, particularly in the present situation, it is necessary to lower the level of troop numbers taking part in major military exercises of which notification must be given under the Helsinki Final Act.

The time has also come to set about effectively tackling the unresolved problems at the conference. The worst bottleneck there, as is known, is the question of notifications concerning major exercises of ground, naval, and air forces. It goes without saying that these are serious problems; they must be resolved thoroughly in the interest of increasing confidence in Europe. But if it is not possible for the time being to resolve them comprehensively [v komplekse], why not seek to solve them piece by piece [po chastyam]. For instance, to reach agreement now on notifications of major ground and air force exercises and to carry the question of naval activity over to the next stage of the conference.

It is no accident that a considerable proportion of the new Soviet initiatives are addressed directly to Europe. In efforts to achieve a sharp turn in favor of the policy of peace, Europe could have a special mission. This mission is building detente anew.

Europe has essential and frequently unique historical experience in this sphere. It is enough to recall that through the joint efforts of the Europeans, the United States, and Canada the Helsinki Final Act was drawn up. If a specific and tangible example of the new way of thinking and political psychology in the approach to problems of peace, cooperation, and international trust is needed, then this historic document can largely provide it.

VI.

For the Soviet Union, as one of the major Asian powers, ensuring security in Asia is of vital importance. The Soviet program for eliminating nuclear and chemical weapons by the end of the current century is in tune with the moods of the peoples of the Asian Continent for whom the problems of peace and security are just as acute as for the peoples of Europe. One cannot fail to recall here that Japan -- its cities Hiroshima and Nagasaki -- fell victim to nuclear bombings, while Vietnam was the target of chemical weapons.

We value highly the construction initiatives put forward by socialist countries in Asia, India, and other members of the Nonaligned Movement. We attach great importance to the fact that both of the nuclear powers located on the Asian Continent, the USSR and the PRC, have pledged the nonfirst-use of nuclear weapons.

The implementation of our program would radically change the situation in Asia. It would also deliver the peoples in that part of the world from the fear engendered by the nuclear and chemical threat and would raise security in that region to a qualitatively new level.

We regard our program as a contribution to the joint quest of all Asian countries for a common, comprehensive approach to the establishment of a system of secure and lasting peace on this continent.

VII.

Our new proposals are addressed to the entire world. The switch to active steps to stop the arms race and reduce arms is also a necessary prerequisite for resolving ever worsening global problems: the destruction of man's environment, the need to find new sources of energy, and the struggle against economic backwardness, hunger, and disease.

The principle of armament instead of development imposed by militarism must be replaced by the reverse order of things -- disarmament for development. The noose of the trillion-dollar debt which is now strangling dozens of countries and entire continents is a direct consequence of the arms race. More than $250 billion are annually pumped out of the developing states, a sum almost identical to the size of the giant U.S. military budget. In fact, this coincidence is far from coincidental.

The Soviet Union advocates that all arms limitation and reduction and every move toward getting rid of nuclear weapons should not only bring the peoples greater security, but should also make it possible to allocate greater resources to improving people's living conditions. It is no coincidence that the peoples seeking to emerge from backwardness and to reach the level of the highly developed industrial countries link the prospects for removing the debt dependency on imperialism which exhausts their economies with the limitation and elimination of armaments, the reduction of military expenditure, the transfer of resources to social and economic development goals. This topic will undoubtedly occupy a very important place during the upcoming international disarmament and development conference in Paris this summer.

The Soviet Union is opposed to the implementation of measures in the disarmament sphere being made dependent on so-called regional conflicts. What lies behind this is both a reluctance to travel the path of disarmament and a desire to impose on sovereign peoples a will that is alien to them, usages which make it possible to maintain profoundly unjust conditions of existence for some countries at others' expense, and the utilization of their natural, human, and spiritual resources for the egoistic, imperialistic aims of individual states or aggressive groupings. The Soviet Union has opposed and will continue to oppose this. It has been and will be a consistent champion of the peoples' freedom, peace, and security and the strengthening of international law and order. Its aim is not the fanning of regional conflicts, but their liquidation through collective efforts on just principles -- the sooner, the better.

Nowadays there is no shortage of statements of allegiance to the cause of peace. But what is in short supply is concrete action aimed at strengthening its foundations. What too frequently lies behind peace-loving words is a policy of war preparations and a gamble on force. What is more, statements essentially aimed at dispelling the new element that beneficially colors international relations today -- the "spirit of Geneva" -- are also being made from high rostrums. The matter is not confined to statements. Actions are being taken which are plainly calculated to fan hostility and mistrust and to revive the opposite of detente -- the atmosphere of confrontation.

We reject such a way of acting and thinking. We want 1986 not just to be a peaceful year, but to enable us to complete the 20th century under the sign of peace and nuclear disarmament. The package of new foreign policy initiatives proposed by us is designed to ensure that mankind greets the year 2000 beneath peaceful skies and space, that it does not fear a nuclear, chemical, or any other threat of destruction and is firmly confident of its own survival and the continuation of the human race.

The resolute new actions now being undertaken by the Soviet Union to protect peace and improve the entire international situation are an expression of the body and spirit of our domestic and foreign policy and their organic fusion. That fundamental historic law-governed feature emphasized by Vladimir Ilich Lenin. The whole world can see that our country raises still higher the banner of peace, freedom, and humanism raised above the planet by Great October.

When it is a matter of preserving peace and freeing mankind from the threat of nuclear war no one can remain indifferent or aloof.

This is a matter for each and every one of us. The contribution of each state, big or small, socialist or capitalist, is important here. The contribution of each responsible political party, each public organization, and each person is important here.

There is no task more urgent, noble, or humane than pooling all our efforts to achieve this lofty goal. This task must be fulfilled by people of our generation, without transferring it onto our descendants' shoulders. That is the command of the time, if you will, the burden of historic responsibility for our decisions and actions in the period remaining before the beginning of the 3d millennium.

The course of peace and disarmament has been and remains the core of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet State. Actively pursuing it, the Soviet Union is ready for extensive cooperation with all who act from positions of reason, goodwill, and an awareness of the responsibility for safeguarding mankind's future -- a future without wars or weapons.

West Must Respond to Statement

LD152334 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2002 GMT 15 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Excerpts] The "Vremya" program has already acquainted you with the statement by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. While our review is on the air, news agency teleprinters are working at full speed. This most important document is being carried by all the leading mass media organs. Reports of it will be published today in the evening newspapers of West European and U.S. countries; tomorrow we can await commentaries on this truly important international event.

So today the world has witnessed yet another peace-loving initiative by the Soviet leadership. Moscow has again stated its desire for peace, Moscow has again proposed a specific program for the elimination of the threat of thermonuclear self-destruction that hangs over the planet. There is, of course, no need to talk about the importance and the timely nature of this document. Now it is up to the West. We shall wait to see how the West as a whole, and Washington in particular, reacts to the statement of the general secretary of the CPSU.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

GORBACHEV GREETS SCIENTIFIC CONGRESS ON PEACEFUL FUTURE

LD160932 Moscow TASS in English 0927 GMT 16 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 16 TASS -- Follows the full text of a message of greeting from Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to a congress of scientists and cultural workers for a peaceful future of the planet:

I greet the attendees at the congress of scientists and cultural workers for a peaceful future of the planet.

Your congress opens the calendar of tangible actions which will certainly abound in 1986 which has been declared by the United Nations Organization the International Year of Peace. It is significant that you have gathered in Warsaw, a city whose present-day appearance symbolizes man's irresistible will for constructive endeavour and peace.

Humanity today is facing quite a few complex and difficult problems, at national, regional and global levels.

But there is no one more urgent among them than the task of removing the nuclear threat -- stopping the arms race on earth and preventing it from spreading to outer space -- and preserving civilization.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva has kindled hope for improvements in the international situation and stronger general security. But for the hope to materialize, it is essential that both sides fulfill the reached accords in good faith. The Geneva process should be carried on and determine the further course of events in the world, which is demanded by the peoples and which is really necessary.

I can assure the delegates to the congress that the Soviet Union will continue to do everything that depends on it in order to curb the arms race, to terminate it on earth and prevent it in outer space. This is what our far-reaching steps, plans and proposals coming in line with the interests of further progress of all humankind are aimed at. Our choice is not military competition, but comprehensive international cooperation in all spheres, including the sphere of science and culture.

In a bid to assist to a maximum degree a radical improvement of the international situation and the ridding of the human race, once and for all, of the fear of the possibility of a nuclear holocaust or use of other barbaric weapons of mass annihilation, the Soviet Union has just advanced a peace initiative of historic significance addressed to the United States of America, the other nuclear powers, to all governments and nations of the world.

We propose to reach agreement on the adoption of a program for the complete elimination of nuclear weapons the world over within the next 15 years, before the end of the 20th century, we put forward a concrete plan of step-by-step measures leading toward that goal and provide for strict international verification of their implementation. We are convinced that this is a realistic prospect, naturally, on the condition that the development of space strike weapons is renounced. The atom only for peace, outer space only for peace -- such is our program.

We also propose to eliminate as early as in this century the chemical weapons, their stockpiles and the industrial base for their manufacture -- also under strict verification, including international on-site inspections.

We suggest banning the development of non-nuclear arms based on new physical principles and approaching nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction in their hitting power.

We also consider it possible to reach, at long last, meaningful accords of mutual troop and arms reductions in the centre of Europe at the Vienna talks and on non-use of force and strengthening mutual confidence at the conference in Stockholm.

As one more confirmation of the seriousness and sincerity of its intentions and of its readiness to go over as soon as possible to practical actions for strengthening peace and delivering mankind from the threat of nuclear war, the Soviet Union has decided to prolong for another three months the moratorium it declared on any nuclear explosions and urges the United States and then other nuclear powers to accede to it.

In short the Soviet Union comes up with a concrete programme for achieving the aim to which your congress is devoted, the aim of safeguarding a peaceful future for this planet. And we appeal to the peace forces throughout the world to support this programme.

We are convinced that mankind's intellectual potential should be used for amplifying its material and cultural riches and not for developing new types of deadly weapons of global destruction.

Peaceful cooperation of states and peoples, and not preparation for "star wars" -- such is the way we understand mankind's approach to the question of space. Peaceful space is an important precondition for banishing the war danger from the life of people.

The great power of the struggle for peace lies in the words of truth, truth about terrible consequences of a nuclear conflict, unless it is averted.

The attendees at your congress -- influential representatives of scientific and cultural communities -- can play a significant role in disseminating this truth and making broad public circles aware of their humane duty to take an active part in efforts for a really lasting peace.

I wish your congress success in its work towards the common aim which is the main one for all -- the triumph of a lasting peace on earth.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

USSR 12 JANUARY WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD122026 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 12 Jan 86

["International Observers' Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, chief editor of MOSKOVSKOYE NOVOSTI; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Excerpt] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades. Well, we have gotten used to the fact that we are already living in 1986. The United Nations has declared this year to be a year of peace, and there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of people want it to be just that. In addition to the desires, there are real prerequisites which have been set down, in particular during the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. Stanley Hoffmann, an eminent U.S. writer and political scientist is currently giving his thoughts in this connection in the press. He writes: The choice is close to hand. On the one hand, there is an opportunity to conclude the first agreement for a radical reduction in nuclear armaments. The price for reaching that kind of an agreement would be the rejection of the wild and dangerous prospects that are linked with the SDI. It would bring additional benefits in the (?shape) of improved relations between the great powers. On the other hand, there is the possibility of bringing about an unrestrained and death-dealing arms race and a deterioration in the political climate, not just between Moscow and Washington, but between the United States and its allies, which fear the ultimate strategic and political consequences of the "star wars" program. Will the positive process in Soviet-U.S. relations that was mapped out at the Geneva summit meeting be developed, Hoffmann asks; or will the monster of the SDI, as it is called, be allowed to frustrate this process? Well, many people are asking this kind of question, and, as we see, they are also doing so in the United States. As far as an answer is concerned, well, the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments are due to be resumed in the very near future. Evidently, something will begin to become clear then.

UN "Year of Peace"

[Gerasimov] But I do not think that any of the diplomats who voted in favor of the relevant UN General Assembly resolution on 24 October last year -- the resolution that declared this year to be International Peace Year -- I do not think that any of these diplomats was so naive as to expect that 1986 will become a year of peace by itself just by virtue of a heartfelt resolution. Accordingly, the report by the UN secretary general on this subject also put it like this: Although 1986 will possibly not become a year of peace throughout the world, it must become a year of struggle for peace. The Soviet Union met Peace Year by repeating its call to the United States

to follow our good example and end all nuclear tests. Our country proposed a concrete goal: that all states and all peoples act in such a way as to make 1986 go down in history as the year of the decline of nuclear explosions. According to data from the Swedish Institute for Defense Research, since Hiroshima, the beginning of the nuclear era, about 1,600 nuclear explosions have been carried out. Of these, about 800 represent the U.S. share, and about 600 represent the share that we have been obliged to carry out. We are willing to close the account, to rule it off, to give up arithmetical parity and perhaps the cognition of some nuances revealed by the U.S. opponents around about the 750th explosion. But the United States is not willing to close off the count, because, you see, it has to study the nuclear reactor for the X-ray laser for "star wars" weapons; and it also turns out, because even with this start, amounting to 200 explosions, it supposedly has to catch up the Soviet Union in modernizing its nuclear arsenal, whereas in actual fact it is simply a question of seeking a way to obtain military superiority.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

USSR'S ZAGLADIN VIEWS PROSPECTS FOR PEACE, PROSPERITY

PM091539 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 1, Jan 86 pp 3-5

[Vadim Zagladin article: "1986--No Ordinary Year"]

[Excerpts] Every individual and every nation expects something of a New Year. The turn of the year engenders hopes of better things to come. There perhaps is not a person anywhere in the world who does not give thought to how the problems left over from the outgoing year should be resolved.

In this respect 1986 is no exception. At the same time it differs from all preceding years. For us Soviet people and for all mankind. Wherein does this difference lie? What are the specific features of 1986?

Perhaps we should begin with our own domestic affairs. For the New Year is sure to bring us much that is new and momentous.

On the other hand, in our day and age, at this time of accelerating internationalization of the economic and the generally public life of humanity, the outlook for each people unquestionably depends on the trend of developments in the world arena. And, of course, on how the basic, paramount question at the end of the 20th century -- the question of war and peace -- will be resolved.

The dialectical interdependence of internal political and international problems is a hallmark of the eve of the 21st century. It is from this that our Leninist party proceeds in its deliberations and decisions. Taking the realities of the situation into account, we say: 1986 should above all be a year of the real strengthening of peace.

I.

The United Nations Organization has proclaimed 1986 the International Year of Peace. This important decision prompted by a deep sense of responsibility is supported by the entire world community. True, this support is not equally meaningful everywhere. Our country, like most countries of the world, believes that the Year of Peace should be one of practical steps to terminate the arms race; it should mark a turn from confrontation to detente.

But there is also another approach: While welcoming the proclamation of 1986 as a Year of Peace, some governments have no intention of renouncing policies pursuing altogether different ends. They do not propose to put an end to the arms race. One cannot help but ask: Are they not seeking to use the very idea of a year of peace as a mask for a policy of confrontation?

The situation in the international arena is so grave that any attempt to camouflage the growth of the danger of war, or the threat of catastrophe, by pompous rhetoric can only increase that danger. For such attempts are tantamount to deception of people anxious about their future, to misleading them, to dulling their vigilance and thereby lowering the pitch of the antiwar struggle and clearing the way for the continuation of the irresponsible and suicidal arms buildup.

Doublethink, lip service to peace while accelerating the material preparation of war, has always been odious and has always presented new dangers to the cause of life. Today it is doubly odious and dangerous.

Nineteen eighty-five left behind great hopes. Hopes that peace will be strengthened and relations between countries and peoples improved. These hopes have come to be called the "spirit of Geneva."

Indeed, at the Geneva meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan the sides agreed:

-- That nuclear war, as well as any other kind of war, between the Soviet Union and the United States must be ruled out. In a nuclear conflict there can be no victors;

-- That neither side will seek military superiority. The leaders of the two countries confirmed the agreement of January 8, 1985, in conformity with which the subject of the Geneva talks is to be non-militarization of outer space and reduction of nuclear armaments on earth;

-- That the regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons has to be made more effective;

-- That such a barbarous instrument of mass destruction as chemical weapons should be prohibited and abolished;

-- That the sides will help to bring the Stockholm conference to speedy completion. Its final document should include both concrete commitments to refrain from the use of force and mutually acceptable confidence-building measures.

Understandings were also reached as regards the further promotion of contacts between the two countries, including contacts at the highest level.

Some of our Soviet readers might ask: Why repeat this all over again? After all, we already know all that.

But repetition is necessary. Primarily because in our opinion the Geneva understandings are not simply the words that went into the joint statement. Of course, such statement are not treaties. Nevertheless, Moscow regards it as a binding commitment underwritten by the leaders of the two countries. We see in the Geneva understandings a programme of practical action, including action in 1986. This being the case, they must be repeated, moreover, translated into practice.

There is also another reason for repeating them. During meetings with visitors from the United States and a number of other Western countries in the final weeks of 1985, we found that many of them did not know exactly what the Soviet Union and the United States agreed upon in Geneva. As a rule, they knew that further meetings were planned. But specifically what was to be done? On what areas did Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan consider it necessary to concentrate efforts? This they did not know.

This was partly due to the way Western information media report events, even events as important as Geneva, especially if they are not to the taste of one or another influential quarter. But even more to blame are precisely these influential quarters, primarily the U.S. military-industrial complex.

Considerable effort was exerted before Geneva to torpedo the Soviet-American summit or at least to make it meaningless. Now, as Mikhail Gorbachev observed during a conversation with Professor Bernard Lown, these quarters have mounted an attack on the outcome of Geneva along various lines and by diverse means.

More money is being channelled to military space programmes in the U.S. under a record military budget. Target satellites intended for testing anti-missile weapons are being launched into orbit. More and more underground nuclear tests are being carried out. Campaigns are mounted against normalization of relations with the U.S.S.R. against the strengthening of mutual trust between our countries.

But let us return to the subject of Geneva. The "spirit of Geneva" is the legacy 1985 left to the year just ushered in. The transatlantic hawks, however, are clearly preparing their own present to the newborn year. They are bent on turning the Year of Peace into a year of the continuation and intensification of confrontation. Geneva is for them, if not a bad word, then something to be forgotten.

From the very beginning it was clear that realization of the Geneva understandings would require of both sides no little effort, a fresh approach to many things, and, above all, the political will to work in this direction on the part of the leaders of both countries. The Soviet Union demonstrated that will in the year now past by undertaking unilateral actions requiring courage, determination and awareness of the realities of the present-day world in order to open the way to a peaceful future. The most important of these steps was the unilateral termination of all nuclear explosions as of August 6, 1985. Our country thereby showed that we are ready to refrain from modernizing nuclear weapons and from developing new types of these weapons, that are prepared to embark on the road leading to the gradual elimination of this type of weapons.

We have been told that prohibition of nuclear tests presupposes verification. Right enough. Experience has already shown that verification of explosions is perfectly possible by national means. This was proved, for instance, when Soviet experts detected American low-yield nuclear tests of which no notification had been given.

But we are prepared to go even farther. To make use of the openings afforded by the proposal of leaders of India, Sweden, Argentina, Tanzania, Greece, and Mexico. In the event of an effective ban on explosions we would not be opposed to appropriate on-the-spot verification. This is our position. We are ready resolutely to forge ahead.

The U.S. side, at least at this writing, has not evinced similar readiness. And some American sources make no secret of why this is so. The reason is that the U.S. is developing new types of weapons, space weapons included.

It should be borne in mind that one of the U.S. "arguments" in favour of the Strategic Defence Initiative was that it supposedly will lead to the elimination of nuclear weapons. Now it is admitted that nuclear devices are essential for the realization of SDI. Could 1986 mark the beginning of the saturation of outer space with nuclear death?

One does not want to believe this. But unwillingness to believe is not enough. What is needed is struggle -- unceasing, active, steadily mounting struggle. That struggle is under way. It is waged by the socialist countries. In the recent period the socialist community has on repeated occasions (in Sofia, Prague, Moscow and Bucharest) clearly declared that it is firmly opposed to the militarization of outer space and is for the ending of nuclear tests and for the reduction of nuclear arsenals. This struggle is waged also by the non-aligned and neutral countries, and by diverse political organizations, including the Communist Socialist and Social Democratic Parties. It is being waged by the biggest mass movement of the end of the 20th Century -- the anti-war movement. The stake in this fight is enormous, of global dimensions; it is a matter of surviving together or dying together. Humanity wants to live.

Nineteen eighty-six has been proclaimed International Year of Peace. Actually it is a case of making it a year of struggle for peace. We all want this struggle to produce results. We want this year to mark a real turn toward peace in world affairs.

II.

But will it be a year of such a turn? We said above that in our time international politics and the internal affairs of every nation are closely interlinked. The relationship is reciprocal. Looking at things from our Soviet standpoint, from the positions of a large socialist country, we realize full well that international developments depend to a great extent on how the Soviet people manage their domestic affairs.

It should be recalled that when the Washington hawks turned from detente to renewed confrontation in the mid-seventies, they hoped, among other things, that the socialist countries and primarily the Soviet Union would not be able to cope with the economic problems that asserted themselves at the time. They thought that socialism would be weakened and hence become more "pliable" and capitulate under Western pressure. This was the point of departure in the planning of diverse boycotts and in giving effect to them. This was the underlying consideration in exerting pressure on Poland and Cuba and in threatening now one, now another socialist country with sanctions.

But they miscalculated, and not for the first time. Again it was plan that, as a social system, socialism possesses a tremendous inbuilt potential, which if properly used, enables it to resolve the most complex problems. Today this is beginning to be recognized, true, reluctantly.

This perhaps underlies the increased inclination on the part of certain highly influential quarters in Western Europe, and also in overseas countries, towards a measure of normalization of relations with our country. If this is so, the future will to no small extent depend on our further development and its results.

A dual responsibility devolves on every Soviet citizen, on every citizen of the socialist world: responsibility for the future of his country (and hence also for his own future) and responsibility for the cause of peace. Everyone in the countries of the new society should understand this. What the West should understand is that socialism is aware of its responsibility and is doing its utmost to act accordingly.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

NEW BOOK BY BOVIN REVIEWED IN PRAVDA

PM101549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[A. Ivkin book review: "Conversation to the Point"]

[Text] The International Relations Publishing House suggested to political observer Aleksandr Bovin that he systematize his answers to questions put in verbal form before different audiences. This was how this small book appeared ["Let's Talk to the Point... About Peace and War, Detente and Confrontation, Disarmament and the Arms Race, and About Other Problems of World Politics" -- "Pogovorim po Sushchestvu...o Mire i Voyne, Razryadke i Konfrontatsii, Razoruzhenii i Gonke Vooruzheniy i o Drugikh Problemakh Mirovoy Politiki" -- International Relations Publishing House, Moscow, 1985]. Those who have heard Bovin's comments (on television, for example), know that he is an interesting speaker: He speaks clearly and argues logically and in a well-reasoned manner, without avoiding the sharp corners of modern international life.

In the book the intonations of the spoken word are preserved -- which is what the author sought, pointing out that "there is no need here to seek the honed, accomplished formulas peculiar to the language of diplomats." The accent is placed on the logic of events, on ties between cause and effect, and on explanation, not on formulas. The form of the book, which is addressed to the young reader above all, also seems felicitous.

The dialogue begins with the most important question: Will there be nuclear war? This question entails others: on the fate of detente, the "star wars" program, the causes of regional conflicts, the situation in "third world" countries...The author shows that mankind is capable of coping with this Gordian knot without having recourse to Caesar's method [as published] -- for swords nowadays are nuclear ones. "...My ideology, my world outlook, the world outlook of a Communist, are imbued with historical optimism," he says. "This optimism includes faith in progress, in the onward march of history, and consequently, in the possibility of preserving peace."

The book helps you to better understand the causes and interconnections of various phenomena in international life and to think, together with the author, about ways to resolve the fundamental problem of the present time -- the problem of war and peace.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

MOSCOW ADVOCATES RESUMPTION OF NUCLEAR TALKS WITH UK

LD082301 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 8 Jan 86

[Valentin Vasilyets commentary]

[Text] Coming up next is a commentary by Valentin Vasilyets. He outlines what could be done by the USSR and the UK to build up European security. This is what he writes:

It might seem as if everybody in the East and the West has agreed long ago that the concentration of nuclear weapons in Europe has reached a dangerous point. However, last year saw another nuclear buildup, when 236 more American missiles were sited in Europe, part of them in Britain. The American nuclear buildup in Europe was carried out despite the fact that the number of Soviet medium-range missiles was reduced to a level of 15 years standing. In this context there are few reasons to be optimistic about the near future. On the other hand it has become still clearer that there is a need to stop this dangerous process. There is hardly anybody who would sincerely believe that those 236 new American missiles have fostered somebody's security. We here in the Soviet Union are convinced that greater security and stability can be promoted only through broader cooperation, through reducing the level of military confrontation and nuclear stockpiles. All European nations big and small can contribute to this cause, acting collectively or individually.

The Soviet Union and Britain could do much to make the world a safer place by the end of the year.

Europe was the birthplace of the relaxation of tension in which Britain has played a major role. There are no grounds to say that Britain has benefited by the attempts to torpedo the relaxation of tension, or that it would lose something if it fully restores its political, trading, and cultural relations with the USSR. The Soviet Union has been keeping its doors open.

It's clear that quicker progress towards the relaxation of tension would improve the situation in Europe. Last year several chances were missed to achieve one of the most important and most easily achievable goals in the cause of curbing the arms race, namely an overall stop to nuclear testing. London has followed the example of Washington and refused to join the Soviet moratorium on all nuclear tests. An excellent opportunity to apply effective brakes on the arms race has been missed.

The obedience of the British leaders must have been appreciated in Washington, but this is Britain's only gain, if it can be called a gain. In any case, it is smaller than the benefits Britain would get should nuclear disarmament begin. A stop to nuclear tests would become a serious obstacle in the way of developing ever new types of weapons of mass destruction, and with time make the existing nuclear arsenals outdated.

This year would become a historic milestone if Britain and the Soviet Union, together with the United States, resume negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear test ban, which broke up after the United States staged a walkout and take them to a successful outcome; the more so since verification, an argument so frequently used by the adversaries of a nuclear test ban treaty is no longer a problem. The only obstacle is Washington's determination to go ahead with its nuclear buildup and take weapons into space.

The British Government has been following in Washington's footsteps despite the opinion of its people. Eighty percent of the British people are in favor of stopping nuclear weapon tests. We are confident that the more countries come out against "star wars," the better for world peace. Should Britain, a country with centuries-old political traditions, join its voice to the chorus of condemnation, it'll be easier to ban weapons from space. In case weapons are put in space, the security of people in the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States would lessen it. The benefits that have been promised to British monopolies in exchange for participation in the "star wars" program cannot justify this risk.

What is more, there is no indication that the Americans are going to share orders and profits with anybody. The conservative government policy being what it is, all I've just said about possible actions by the Soviet Union and Britain for European security must have sounded fantastic. The Soviet national daily IZVESTIYA has said that Britain's rulers have never failed to obey orders from Washington, which as is known, has (?never) ordered broader cooperation and understanding in Europe.

And so only collective efforts can strengthen security. Something has to be done. The British Government as a first step could make a more serious approach to the search for points of agreement between the two countries. This search does not require abandoning the Atlantic solidarity, something Britain has placed before many other things. It could act in a way that would persuade others. The Soviet Union, unlike the United States, believes that should the military and strategic balance be upset in anybody's favor, world peace and security would become less stable. Only joint actions can bring about a lasting world peace and security. And let's hope that Britain and the United States this year show greater understanding of today's realities.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

TASS: KOHL DISCUSSES FRG POLICY ON SECURITY ISSUES

LD092309 Moscow TASS in English 2128 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] Bonn, January 9 TASS -- West Germany Chancellor Helmut Kohl today held his first press conference this year, devoted to foreign policy objectives of his cabinet for the forthcoming period and East-West relations.

Undoubtedly, 1986 will for the most part be under the influence of the talks under way between the two great powers and also the second summit meeting between the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan, said the head of the Bonn government.

Kohl spoke at length on questions of "promoting peace and security", improving East-West relations and the striving of the West German Government for progress in reaching an interim agreement on medium-range nuclear missiles, in issues of banning nuclear weapon tests, and imposing a complete and universal ban on chemical arms.

Noteworthy is the fact that the words of the federal chancellor do not tally with Bonn's concrete deeds. It is exactly the Federal Republic of Germany, as one of the European countries, which holds a far from constructive stand on all of these issues. For instance, the West German Government sanctioned and deploys new U.S. first-strike nuclear missiles in its territory. It is on these days that the first of 96 deadly cruise missiles, allotted to the Federal Republic of Germany, has been delivered to the Hunsruck forest area, the site of the U.S. Han military base.

Bonn has so far failed to give a proper response to the proposal of the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia for the opening of talks on setting up a zone free of chemical weapons in central Europe. It trots out as a pretext an argument that regional solution of this problem will allegedly hamper the process of complete and universal prohibition of chemical arms.

Heedless to strong protests by public at large against Washington's ominous designs to develop the much-vaunted U.S. "Strategic Defence Initiative", the West German Government sanctioned West German firms' involvement in the "star wars" programme.

Responding to a question by TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy if they in West Germany are aware of the negative consequences for the development of East-West relations of the moves to scale up the arms race and spread it into outer space, Helmut Kohl dodged a direct answer saying that the stand of the West German Government on this issue was known.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

PRAVDA: BULGARIAN MINISTER ON ARMS RACE, EAST-WEST RELATIONS

PM101549 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Article by P. Mladenov, member of the BCP Central Committee Politburo and Bulgarian Foreign Minister: "Mankind's Hope"]

[Excerpts] Sofia--Never before have the flights of human genius opened up such potential for social progress, and at the same time never before has our planet been so close to the fatal line beyond which lies the threat of universal annihilation. Which path will be chosen? This is the question which now troubles peoples, statesmen, and public figures. Common sense sees only one answer, namely that we must eliminate the nuclear threat and achieve a positive turn in international affairs.

The socialist community countries have invariably countered attempts to apply a military solution to the historical dispute between the two socioeconomic systems with their political philosophy and their entire foreign political activity. The thesis of peaceful coexistence forms the basis of the Warsaw Pact countries' foreign policy. This is why they resolutely oppose the arms race and its escalation and advocate an equilibrium of forces in the military sphere and a progressive reduction in armament levels.

The foreign policy credo of the fraternal socialist countries found a vivid expression in the Warsaw Pact states' statement adopted in Sofia in October 1985. In that statement the fraternal countries categorically reaffirmed their support for the USSR's peace initiatives and collectively expressed specific ideas and proposals for overcoming the dangerous development in international affairs. The very existence of the fraternal defensive military and political alliance and, equally, the unity of the peoples building a new society serve as the main guarantee of peace and security. The socialist countries' active and purposeful foreign policy, which counters confrontation with equitable political dialogue and statesmanlike wisdom plays an exceptionally important role. The Sofia conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee confirmed once again that the socialist countries are fully aware of their special responsibility for the fate of mankind and their historical mission in the struggle to deliver mankind from war and violence.

The fraternal countries, professions of desire for a positive turn in international relations are no empty words; they are based on concrete deeds. The unilateral "measures of restraint" adopted by the USSR in various military spheres are an effective factor for normalizing the situation and building confidence. It must also be mentioned that the socialist states have on more than one occasion confirmed their readiness to work and cooperate with anyone who honestly and constructively seeks to improve the international situation, and they have proved it in practice. This is the concrete expression of the approach of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, which is dictated by the realities of our times; and the sooner our Western partners recognize the need to show restraint in international affairs, take each other's interests into account, and cooperate constructively in resolving topical problems, the nearer will come the time when these relations will return to a normal channel and thus revive the beneficial process of detente.

This approach provided the basis for the USSR's stance at the Soviet-American summit, which proved the central event of the past year. True, it did not prove possible to resolve the main problem in USSR-U.S. and East-West relations -- the problem of security and arms reductions. The U.S. Administration's unwillingness to abandon its space plans, its intention to continue advancing down the path of the militarization of space thwarted this. This new attempt to achieve military superiority threatens to turn into the most dangerous encroachment on peace in mankind's entire postwar history. The implementation of the so-called U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" will nullify the role played by albeit partial, nonetheless extraordinarily important curbs on the arms race imposed by the treaties and accords reached in this sphere and will entail the modernization of nuclear arsenals and the destabilization of the strategic situation in Europe and throughout the world.

This is why the socialist community countries and all sober-minded politicians and public figures in Europe, and even in the United States itself, support the alternative put forward by the Soviet Union, that is, international cooperation in the peaceful exploration of space in conditions of its nonmilitarization.

It seems heardly necessary to argue the need for honest, frank and constructive dialogue. At the Geneva meeting the USSR and the United States openly set out their approaches to the solution of international issues -- which represents a good beginning and creates preconditions for continuing dialogue aimed at gaining a better understanding of each other's positions and achieving the mutually acceptable agreements which the world so badly needs.

Bulgaria regards as positive the accords that have been achieved and that are reflected in the Soviet-American joint statement confirming the brief of the Geneva talks on a range of questions relating to space and nuclear arms, stating the impermissibility of unleashing nuclear war, and renouncing the striving for military superiority.

The normalization of certain aspects of of USSR-U.S. bilateral relations would doubtless result in greater trust, the elimination of suspicion, and the development of mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries. This would ultimately promote normalization in the whole range of East-West relations. On the whole, the start made on Soviet-American dialogue in Geneva "creates more favorable opportunities for the normalization of the international situation and a return to detente," as was stated in Prague 21 November 1985 at the meeting of the Warsaw Pact countries' top representatives. "It is important to ensure that these opportunities are translated into practical deeds by both sides." This collective appraisal synthesizes the recognition of the decisive contribution of the USSR and the Soviet delegation to the success of the Geneva meeting, which has given mankind hope and optimism.

As a Balkan country, Bulgaria consistently and unswervingly conducts a policy of good-neighborliness and mutual understanding. It represents an active factor for peace and cooperation in this area and is the initiator and staunch advocate of the idea of transforming the Balkans into a nuclear-free zone. The creation of such a zone is in keeping with the interests not just of the Balkan peoples. It would contribute to a normalization of the situation and would strengthen the atmosphere of confidence and security in Europe as a whole. This also fully applies to the new joint Bulgarian-Romanian initiative proposing to transform the Balkans into a chemical weapon-free zone. For this reason these questions will continue to occupy a fitting place in our socialist foreign policy.

The Communists and all the working people of Bulgaria are profoundly convinced that the peoples' cardinal task at present consists in eliminating the nuclear threat and achieving a change for the better in European and world affairs. In order to resolve this task it is necessary to continue to work toward the creation and consolidation of a broad front of peace-loving forces. Its vanguard was and is the great Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries, which are consistently implementing a policy of peace and good-neighborly cooperation.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: ROMANIA, BULGARIA SUPPORT SOVIET STAND AT GENEVA

LD231646 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 23 Dec 85

[Text] Bucharest, 23 Dec (TASS)--Romania and Bulgaria said in a joint communique on the results of the visit to the Socialist Republic of Romania of Todor Zhivkov, general secretary of the Bulgarian Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the State Council of Bulgaria, and his talks with Nicolae Ceausescu that the two countries would act in the spirit of the Sofia statement by the Warsaw member states to solve the urgent problems of the work for disarmament and peace and removing the threat of a nuclear war. The communique underlines that terminating without delay the arms race on earth, preventing its spread to outer space and passing over to disarmament, primarily nuclear disarmament, are the key problems of the age of ours.

The communique points out that the meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Geneva is an important event of international affairs. Romania and Bulgaria expressed anew full support for the USSR's constructive stand at the Geneva meeting and stressed the fundamental importance of the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. statement to the effect that a nuclear war should never be allowed to break out, that there can be no victors in it and also that neither side will strive for military superiority.

The leaders of Romania and Bulgaria said again that they favoured the establishment of a nuclear-weapon free zone in the Balkans, a universal and total ban on chemical weapons and the adoption of measures to prevent their proliferation. Romania and Bulgaria issued a statement to the heads of state and government of the Balkan countries urging them to turn the Balkans into a zone free of chemical arms.

At the talks, says the communique, the sides reiterated their determination to continue actively developing economic, scientific and technical ties in the spirit of the joint decisions and documents of the top leaders of the fraternal parties and states.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

USSR: PEACE YEAR HERALDS OPPORTUNITY FOR CHANGE

'Positive Developments' Possible

PM061619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "With Faith in the Future"]

[Excerpts] Soviet people and peoples the world over greeted the New Year with the hope that the process of changes for the better in the international arena which emerged last year will now develop further and contribute to resolving practically the most urgent problem of today--stopping the arms race on earth and preventing it from spreading to space.

To preserve peace and put an end to the specter of nuclear war -- today there is no task more important for the whole of mankind. This is the belief of hundreds of millions of people who declare their willingness to actively participate in the struggle to curb imperialism's aggressive aspirations and to bring about disarmament, peaceful coexistence between states, and mutually useful cooperation among peoples. From the very first days of the New Year, many countries are launching preparations for the World Peace Congress to be convened in Copenhagen in October. Everywhere understanding is growing that we must struggle against the threat of war and that the peoples increasingly strong desire for peace represents an important barrier in the way of imperialist reaction unleashing a thermonuclear war.

The Soviet Union has entered the New Year full of determination to strive even more persistently to implement its foreign policy initiatives and proposals, which answer the most cherished aspiration of peoples throughout the world. Firmly following a Leninist foreign policy course, the Communist Party and the Soviet State concentrate their efforts on eliminating the danger of war which looms over the world and ensuring a practical solution to the problem of curbing the arms race and radically reducing -- by one-half -- the corresponding nuclear weapons on the condition of the nonmilitarization of space. The Soviet Union submitted a detailed program for peaceful cooperation in outer space to be examined by the international community. These initiatives met with the support of the United Nations. In actual fact, the only state to vote against the corresponding resolution was the United States, whose ruling circles have embarked on the path of preparing for "star wars" -- a path fraught with irreparable consequences.

Our state sets an example of a wise, far-sighted approach to the problem of halting nuclear weapons tests. In the summer of last year it declared a unilateral moratorium on conducting any nuclear explosions. Unfortunately, the United States did not respond to the appeal to follow our example and did not stop testing. The peoples highly appraise the good will of the Soviet Union, which has consented to discuss the issue of additional monitoring measures in the interests of resolving this problem. We must act so that 1986 goes down in history as the year of the ban on nuclear explosions.

The year that has begun could be marked by major positive developments in the course of the Geneva talks on the problems of nuclear arms reduction if, of course, the U.S. side gives up its plans to militarize space. It is with this aim that our country has proposed halving the nuclear means of the USSR and the United States which can reach each other's territory.

As M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said in his New Year address to the Soviet people, "...the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are persistently leading matters toward peace, toward improving international relations and making them civilized, as befits people of the enlightened 20th century. We must rise above feuds and subordinate all our efforts to seeking ways leading to mutual understanding, trust, and disarmament."

The range of problems and issues on whose solution the future of all mankind depends is broad and varied. The West must show realism and foresight and must be prepared to go its part of the way in the interest of reaching mutually acceptable solutions. However, imperialist forces continue to create more and more new obstacles and artificial obstructions on the path to lasting and stable peace. The United States is undertaking actions not in line with the accords reached at the meeting in Geneva. On the contrary, to the benefit of the military-industrial complex, the U.S. Administration and the Pentagon are forcing the pace of the arms race in their own country and demanding the active assistance of their NATO allies to realize the U.S. program for the militarization of space.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, in close collaboration with the fraternal socialist countries and in cooperation with all peace-loving states, it will conduct matters with even greater persistency so that a course aimed at reducing confrontation between West and East, stopping the arms race on earth and preventing one in outer space, and radically reducing nuclear arms, and ultimately, totally liquidating them gains the upper hand in international life and so that a nuclear war can never take place.

Our people look to the future with optimism. Unanimously approving and supporting the Leninist foreign policy course of the CPSU and the Soviet State, Soviet people are full of determination to do everything necessary in the New Year to further strengthen the might of their socialist motherland and to preserve and strengthen peace on earth.

Action Needed for Reality

PM061854 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Peace Year"]

[Excerpt] Last year -- 1985 -- was filled with many concrete examples of how the Soviet Union understands and fulfills its lofty and responsible mission. This applies primarily to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva -- undoubtedly the major international event of last year. The "Geneva Spirit" emerged; a glimmer of hope emerged.

However, a glimmer of hope can be extinguished if it is not provided with a firm foundation of real achievements. Of course, the significance of the accords reached in Geneva cannot be disputed. This applies, above all, to the common understanding, enshrined in the joint statement, that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that it can have no winners and to the pledge by the USSR and the United States to base their relations on this incontestable truth and not to seek military superiority. But, on the other hand, it has to be stated frankly that no solution was found at the meeting to the most important questions connected with ending the arms race.

The U.S. leadership's reluctance to abandon the "star wars" program made it impossible to arrive at specific accords in Geneva on real disarmament and, above all, on the central problem of nuclear and space arms. The quantity of weapons stockpiled on both sides has not diminished as a result of the meeting; the arms race is continuing.

The Soviet Union has declared and now declares that it will go as far as is necessary toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the final removal of the threat of war involving them, for we advocate ensuring man's primary right -- the right to life. Militarism is hostile to the peoples. The arms race, whipped up by the greed of the military-industrial complex for profit, is foolhardy. It strikes at the vitally important interests of all countries and peoples. This is why we say a firm "No" when it is suggested to us that, instead of destroying nuclear weapons, the arms race also be extended into space.

The Soviet Union is a resolute champion of the peaceful development of international life. The moratorium which it announced on all kinds of nuclear tests is convincing testimony to this. At the 27 December reception in the grand Kremlin Palace for heads of diplomatic missions accredited in the Soviet Union an appeal was once again made to all states and peoples to act to ensure that 1986 goes down in history as the year of the demise of nuclear explosions, as the year when people find within themselves sufficient common sense to rise above narrow, egoistic motives and stop disfiguring their own planet. But, literally the next day -- 28 December -- a new underground nuclear explosion was carried out on a U.S. range in Nevada. No, this was not the kind of New Year "cracker" that mankind was awaiting from Washington.

Today's world is complex and multifaceted. It is the world of the nuclear age and the people of the earth are in the same boat. It is an extremely irresponsible thing to rock it with military adventurism. Life itself nowadays rejects such political thoughtlessness. This is why the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are persistently working for peace, to improve international relations. They urge the other side to rise above strife; to subordinate all efforts to the search for ways to mutual understanding, trust, and disarmament; and to heed the voice of the peoples and their cherished dreams and aspirations which have been reflected in international law and enshrined in the UN General Assembly resolutions adopted on the eve of the New Year.

...On the last night in December in the outgoing year of 1985 the traditional New Year wishes sounded somewhat different on all meridians and parallels of our planet: Happy New Year -- Peace Year! Of course, it will not become this because of wishes alone. There are no miracles in the world not made by human hand -- not even on New Year's eve. The time for words is past. What is needed is action. Only the peoples -- the United Nations -- can work such a miracle and make it real. So let us work it, so as to turn Peace Year, Peace decade from a wish into reality!

Soviet Proposals Strengthen Hope

LD041954 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 4 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video talk by political observer Georgiy Zubkov]

[Text] By a United Nations decision 1986 has been declared Peace Year. We are already getting used to the fact that it is 1986 -- such is the pace of our times. But whatever we may be doing during these first days of the New Year, each of us is thinking about the most important and common thing which unites the various peoples and states of the entire planet. As it was graphically put in the New Year address to the Soviet people, in the nuclear age the people of the earth are all in one ship and this ship, which has cast off from the wharf of 1986, has a name -- "Hope."

Hope: It is threatened by nuclear missiles and bombs concealed inside aircraft; it is in the sights of the machine guns of the soldiers who formed a wall along the center line of the highway on the border between Nicaragua and Honduras. The machine guns barred the way to the peace march around the countries of Central America -- a unique, but symbolical instance.

Looking at these machine gun barrels and nuclear missiles, can we face the future with hope? Does such hope have any basis in reality? Yes, it does. Above all, in the USSR's constructive policy and its series of effective proposals each of which strengthen hope. The USSR advocates an immediate freeze of nuclear weapons and a complete and timeless ban on testing them. The USSR advocates a two-fold reduction in corresponding nuclear means, both its own and U.S. ones. In order for the hope to become reality the West must listen to our country's sensible appeal to rise above quarrelling and devote every effort to searching for ways for mutual understanding, trust, and disarmament. In the first place, it is essential to bar the way to the militarization of space.

The current year is full of important international meetings. In the very first month there are new rounds of talks in Geneva and Vienna, a congress of scientific and cultural figures in defense of the peaceful future of our planet, many international conferences, and numerous events in the framework of the present International Peace Year. All these strengthen hope because hope not only warms man's life, but demands an active struggle. Hope is not a fruitless dream, but a call to action.

Signs of Change Apparent

PM061255 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Anatoliy Krasikov article under the rubric "Publicist's Thoughts": "Baton of Hope"]

[Excerpts] Last year the first Soviet-U.S. summit for 6 and 1/2 years was held. Virtually all the leading state, political, and public figures as well as the mass media in different countries agreed that this meeting was a major political event of international life. Its result of fundamental importance was that the leaders of two major powers stated in a joint document that nuclear war must never be launched. They emphasized the importance of preventing all wars -- nuclear or conventional -- between the USSR and the United States, pledged not to strive for military superiority, and laid the foundations for dialogue aimed at achieving changes for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the world in general.

But the deep differences still dividing the Soviet Union and the United States on the most acute questions of peace and security did not go unnoticed, of course. There are still as many weapons in the world now after the summit as there were before it. R. Reagan stubbornly adheres to his "Strategic Defense Initiative," which is also known as the "star wars" preparation plan.

As many international observers have noted, the White House chief was caught between the devil and the deep blue sea in Geneva. On the one hand he was pressured by his interlocutor, who was bolstered by the support of the entire peace-loving public of the world. On the other hand, Mr Reagan could not close his eyes to the position of the military-industrial complex, which often acts as true master of the present-day United States, giving direct instructions to the state administration.

The exchange of messages from M.S. Gorbachev to the U.S. people and from R. Reagan to the Soviet people was a sign of change for the better in international relations which inspires hope. This was the first important event of the New Year and another move toward overcoming the distrust which has built up between the two countries.

The two powers' leaders expressed their commitment to the "spirit of Geneva." But at the same time, R. Reagan again outlined the dubious benefits of the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative." That cannot fail to alarm people.

The main and most acute questions worrying mankind last year, as indeed before, were questions of disarmament and the strengthening of international security. They were at the center of attention for participants in the 40th UN General Assembly session. That was a jubilee session. The UN Charter came into force in October 1945.

The United States would very much like to use the United Nations for its own narrow, selfish aims. It is openly pressuring the UN members and striving to induce them to act in a spirit favorable to Washington. However, the developing countries, which make up the majority of UN members, were not intimidated. Over 70 resolutions were adopted on questions of disarmament and strengthening international security. Furthermore, many of these resolutions were adopted despite the stubborn opposition of the United States and its closest allies.

It must also be noted that antiwar actions by representatives of the broadest public strata in defense of peace throughout the world reached an unprecedented scale in 1985. Hundreds of millions of peace campaigners from different countries and continents took part in Disarmament Week alone, which is held each October.

The United Nations has declared this year to be Peace Year. "We in the Soviet Union urge that this Peace Year become a peace decade so that mankind may enter the 21st century in conditions of peace, trust, and cooperation," M.S. Gorbachev stressed in the New Year message to the Soviet people. This desire is in accord with the thoughts and hopes of all the people of the world.

'Dangerous Policy' Denounced

PM031759 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 1 Jan 86 p 3

[Nikolay Pastukhov "Commentator's Opinion": "For Peace and Cooperation"]

[Text] Today is the first day of the New Year of 1986, which by a UN decision has been declared International Peace Year. The last year has receded into history. It was full of many events great and small, joyful and perturbing. The socialist community confidently marching along the path of creation and the consolidation of the cause of peace was the source of joyful events. We adopted the comprehensive program of scientific-technical progress through the end of the second millenium. It will lead us to the front lines of science and technology and improve the prosperity of the citizens of the entire socialist community.

The Soviet Union held a meeting in Geneva with the United States at summit level. Its results instilled optimistic hopes for a better future, for disarmament, detente, and international cooperation. Our country has proposed reducing by 50 percent the strategic nuclear potentials of the USSR and the United States which can reach each other's territory, at the same time renouncing the deployment of weapo·s in space. Now it is up to the United States.

To develop its proposal on halting the nuclear arms race both quantitatively and qualitatively, the USSR declared that it was unilaterally introducing a moratorium on any nuclear explosions, adding that it was prepared to observe it after 1 January 1986 if the United States does the same.

But Washington has expanded and accelerated its nuclear tests, carrying out one explosion after another.

The U.S. Administration is being urged to this by the military-industrial complex, which is straining to go into space with the "star wars" program, naively supposing that it will help the United States achieve world rule. The past year has shown that the "star wars" idea has given rise to resolute protest from all sane mankind. This could be seen particularly clearly at the recent UN session where the United States found itself totally isolated and thus suffered a moral and political defeat in the eyes of the entire world community.

The Soviet and entire progressive public of our planet angrily denounce the dangerous policy of the warmongers and support the sensible stance of the Soviet Union and all Warsaw Pact countries, which are prepared to move from rivalry in armaments toward disarmament, from confrontation toward cooperation. As for our people, under the CPSU's leadership they are looking forward to a peaceful, constructive future. This future was realistically represented in the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program. After approval by our party's 27th Congress, it will be a lodestar for the advance of real socialism, a source of inspiration for all Soviet people in all great achievements.

'Real Consolidation of Peace'

LD041825 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 4 Jan 86

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] The WPC has announced the start of a mass campaign within the framework of the International Year of Peace proclaimed by the UN General Assembly. WPC President Romesh Chandra has appealed to millions of people in various countries to double their efforts in order to achieve Washington's rejection of its "star wars" plans and the U.S. adherence to the moratorium on carrying out nuclear blasts announced by the Soviet Union. I shall ask my colleague, Viktor Levin, to comment on this report.

When the UN General Assembly adopted the decision to proclaim 1986 an International Year of Peace, it appealed to all peoples to join in the UN resolute efforts in defense of the cause of peace and the future of all mankind. The struggle for peace and international security, as the declaration adopted unanimously at the 40th session of the UN General Assembly points out in particular, demands constant and positive actions from states and peoples aimed at preventing war, respecting the principle of the nonuse of force, measures on confidence-building, disarmament, and preserving space for peaceful aims.

An appeal for energetic action is also contained in the message of UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, on the occasion of the start of the International Year of Peace, and in essence, this is also the subject of the WPC's appeal. Such an approach is absolutely right. It is not enough just to proclaim the year which has begun an International Year of Peace; of course, that is important, but the proclamation itself is viewed by the planet's peace-loving forces as a first step, as an appeal to action. The task resides in getting this year to enter history as a year of peace not only in name, but also in content. Is this realistic? Of course it is.

The past year has given an impetus to hope for an improvement in the international political climate. The Geneva meeting between CPSU General Secretary Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan is justly looked upon by the international community as a step in the right direction, as an extremely necessary resumption of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue at summit level. The fact that, by mutual accord, the general secretary of the CPSU addressed the American people with a New Year's greeting, and the U.S. President greeted the Soviet people, was welcomed. I repeat: This is a gratifying circumstance. But if one is to delve into the essence of those mutual New Year's greetings, it will become clear that, in order to fill the spirit of Geneva with material substance, a hard road has yet to be travelled.

Currently, there is the particular acuteness of the issue of the inadmissibility of spreading the arms race to space. The Soviet Union's position on this issue is totally clear: We are ready to take on any obligations in this respect. As regards the United States -- and President Reagan's New Year speech showed this in particular -- it is stubbornly engaged in implementing its "star wars" program, covering it with the camouflage-net of the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Another acute issue is the end of the arms race on earth. Here also the Soviet Union is not only setting forth its position clearly, but is also undertaking concrete actions. What I have in mind is the moratorium on nuclear explosions established by our country. The essence of this action consists in putting an end to the perfection of nuclear weapons and the testing of accumulated stockpiles. Consequently, the moratorium is a concrete and very weighty step on the path to ending the arms race. In addition, in order to make this step, nothing is needed, in essence, beyond good will. However, here also we come up against the negative position of the United States.

It is not difficult to imagine the significance that the U.S. rejection of its "star wars" plans and joining the Soviet moratorium on carrying out nuclear blasts would have. This alone would give grounds for saying that 1986 had really become a year of peace. Therefore, the peace champions represented by the WPC are appealing for a concentration of effort on the struggle to solve the cited problems.

There are more than enough peace declarations being made these days; there are also good words to be heard from Washington. This is reassuring, inasmuch as quite recently they spoke quite differently there, and called the Soviet Union an empire of evil. The change in tone can be entered on the credit side of peace. But nevertheless, an account of full value can only be given on the basis of real deeds. The Soviet Union is demonstrating precisely such deeds, and awaits the same from the United States. The International Year of Peace can and must become a year of real consolidation of peace.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

SOVIET COMMENTATOR VIEWS NORDIC AFFAIRS IN SWEDISH PAPER

PM091210 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER in Swedish 7 Jan 86 p 5

[Yuriy Denisov "Debate" article: "Soviet Invitation to Industrial Cooperation"--DAGENS NYHETER footnote reads: "Yuriy Denisov is considered to be very close to the Soviet Government. The name is a pseudonym."]

[Excerpts] Relations with the Nordic countries have always been important in the Soviet Union's policy toward Europe. In the entirety of this complex of relations a good-neighborly relationship with Sweden has a prominent place.

Without doubt Sweden's policy of neutrality significantly increases the possibilities of further confirming the course of neighborly unity and productive cooperation between the USSR and Sweden in international affairs. The Soviet Union has the greatest respect for this policy of Sweden's. In a situation in which three Nordic countries are members of NATO this realistic and well-tried course is one of the factors which undoubtedly contributes to the preservation of peaceful and stable conditions in this region and prevents it from being drawn into the sphere of international conflects. Sweden's policy is an important element in the endeavors to maintain peace and security in all of Europe.

As far as putting an end to the nuclear arms race is concerned, Sweden has always adopted stances that have attracted much attention. Sweden has proposed that a zone free from "battlefield nuclear weapons" be created in Europe and supports the proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the Nordic area. Sweden's stance also plays a prominent role in questions of global nuclear disarmament. The work carried out by the independent commission for disarmament and security policy questions led by Olof Palme has become an important contribution to the international discussion of questions to do with war or peace.

The Swedish Government is working to halt the arms race on earth and is aware of what a catastrophe it would be if it spread to space.

No one can fail to see that Sweden's adherence to its neutralist policy (and both inside the country and on the other side of the Atlantic there are forces which would like to get it to deviate from this path) and the increasingly active, constructive direction that this course is taking help to heighten the authority of the "Swedish line" and serve the cause of peace in Europe and the entire world.

/8309
CSO: 5200/1230

RELATED ISSUES

BRIEFS

USSR'S KUZNETSOV MEETS DANISH PARLIAMENTARIANS--Moscow, 14 Jan (TASS)--A delegation of the leadership of Denmark's Radical Party [Radical Liberal Party], headed by N. Helveg Petersen, the leader of the party and head of its parliamentary group, paid a visit to the USSR 7-14 January at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. Vasiliy Kuznetsov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium received the guests. The delegation also held conversations in the USSR Foreign Ministry and in the USSR Ministry of Defense, visited institutes, and met representatives of Soviet public organizations. The guests visited Uzbekistan. Problems of halting the nuclear arms race on earth and preventing it in space, of making the international climate in Europe and throughout the world healthier, creating a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe and returning to the policy of constructive dialogue and cooperation were examined during the course of the meetings and conversations. The positive significance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva was noted in this context. [Text] [Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 14 Jan 86] /8309

IZVESTIYA CITES POPE--Rome, 16 Dec--John Paul II, head of the Roman Catholic Church, has delivered a message in which he stressed that peace is based on very shaky foundations. There is a great threat from nuclear weapons, the pope stated. That is why it is so important to hold talks on nuclear arms reduction and the attainment of a mutual accord on measures capable of reducing the possibility of the outbreak of nuclear war. The path to universal and lasting peace lies through the development of dialogue between different countries, the message goes on to say. Today such a dialogue is more necessary than ever, and this applies first and foremost to the talks in Geneva at which problems of arms reduction and limitation are being discussed. [Text] [Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4] /8309

CSO: 5200/1230

END